

The Dublin Review

OCT., NOV., DEC., 1923

A CONTROVERTED SHAKESPEARE DOCUMENT

IN the edition of *Shakespeare's Works* brought out in 1790 by Edmund Malone, a scholar celebrated at a later date for his exposure of the Ireland forgeries, he printed a curious piece of evidence of which he gave the following account :

About twenty years ago, one Mosely, a master-bricklayer, who usually worked with his men, being employed by Mr. Thomas Hart, the fifth descendant in a direct line from our poet's sister, Joan Hart, to new-tile the old house at Stratford in which Mr. Hart lives, and in which our poet was born, found a very extraordinary manuscript between the rafters and the tiling of the house. It is a small paper book, consisting of five leaves stitched together. It had originally consisted of six leaves, but unluckily the first was wanting when the book was found. I have taken some pains to ascertain the authenticity of this manuscript, and after a very careful inquiry am perfectly satisfied that it is genuine.

The writer, John Shakspeare, calls it his Will, but it is rather a declaration of his faith and pious resolutions. Whether it contains the religious sentiments of our poet's father or *elder* brother, I am unable to determine. The handwriting is undoubtedly not so ancient as that *usually* written about the year 1600 ; but I have now before me a manuscript written by Alleyn, the player, at various times between 1599 and 1614, and another by Forde, the dramattick poet, in 1606, in nearly the same handwriting as that of the manuscript in question. The Rev. Mr. Davenport, Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon, at my request endeavoured to find out Mr. Mosely, to examine more particularly concerning this manuscript ; but he died about two years ago. His daughter,

A Controverted

however, who is now living, and Mr. Hart, who is also living and now sixty years old, perfectly well remember the finding of this paper. Mosely some time after he had found it gave it to Mr. Payton, an alderman of Stratford, who obligingly transmitted it to me through the hands of Mr. Davenport. It is proper to observe that the finder of this relique bore the character of a very honest, sober and industrious man and that he neither asked nor received any price for it, and I may also add that its contents are such as no one could have thought of inventing with a view to literary imposition.*

It will be noticed that in this statement Malone makes no mention of John Jordan, the wheelwright of Stratford-on-Avon, who is now commonly held to have perpetrated the "forgery." From various letters printed by Halliwell-Phillipps, it is abundantly clear, not only that Dr. Davenport and Mr. Payton had made themselves responsible for sending the document to London, but that Malone did take a considerable amount of trouble to verify the account of it which had been given him. The manuscript had been in his hands for some months before he had it set up in type, and while there was still time to cancel the whole, he became aware that a *copy* of the same paper had been sent by Jordan to the *Gentleman's Magazine* five or six years earlier and had been "rejected as spurious." Malone was able at full leisure to study, not a copy, but the original leaves, the ink of which was so faint in places that, as we shall see, he once or twice misread the text. None the less, despite the fact that forgeries were in the air and that Malone himself only six years before had been prominent in denouncing the Chatterton fabrications, he unhesitatingly declared that, so far as the writing was concerned, these five leaves were genuinely ancient. It must not be forgotten in estimating the value of this statement that Malone had had considerable experience in studying documents of the Shakespearean epoch. If he was not a brilliant scholar, he was eminently painstaking and sensible. No doubt he stated some years later that he was satisfied that the alleged spiritual Testament

* Malone, *Shakespeare's Works* (Ed. 1790), Vol. II, p. 162.

Shakespeare Document

"could not have been the composition of John Shakespeare, the poet's father, nor of any member of his family,"* but he never withdrew his declaration that the five leaves were a genuine specimen of Seventeenth Century script.

More modern critics, though they have not set eyes upon the original, almost to a man treat the supposed discovery with contempt, designating John Jordan in particular as the fabricator. In an article on "Recent Shakespeare Research," in the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1921, Mr. C. R. Haines remarks that "the so-called will of John Shakespeare, an absurd rigmarole found like a dead mouse behind the wainscot of the birth-place, still meets with ardent champions among Roman Catholics."† Sir Sidney Lee refers to Jordan as "the earliest forger to obtain notoriety," and informs us that "his most important achievement was the forgery of the will of Shakespeare's father." Halliwell-Phillipps is equally disdainful and declares that "there can be no doubt that the whole of the paper is a modern fabrication." Naturally enough, the older commentators, like Charles Knight, mostly emphasized the same note.‡

To the average reader, interested only in the Shakespearean problems involved, this spiritual testament must inevitably seem, as Mr. Haines styles it, "an absurd rigmarole." It is so long that I do not propose to reproduce it here in its entirety. The reader will remember that the portion first printed by Malone from what purported to be the original document itself lacked the introductory sections. It began in the middle of a sentence with some words about "at least spiritually in will adoring," etc. The first complete paragraph is numbered IV and in it the writer declares his intention and desire to receive before death the sacrament of Extreme Unction. In the fifth and sixth he protests his steadfast hope in God's mercy, repudiating all idea of

* Malone's repudiation only appeared in 1796, when he was denouncing the Ireland forgeries in his *Inquiry* (p. 198). The terms he uses should be carefully noted.

† *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 236, p. 231.

‡ A noteworthy exception is Dr. Nathan Drake, the author of *Shakespeare and his Times*, Vol. I, pp. 9-13.

A Controverted

merit on his own part but basing his confidence upon the Blood of Jesus Christ. In the seventh he declares his readiness to endure such bodily pains as God may send him, protesting beforehand that any signs of impatience he may show are against his will and drawn from him only by human infirmity. In the eighth he proclaims his ready forgiveness of all injuries and in the ninth he declares his gratitude to God for innumerable past mercies, "even when I was plunged in the dirty puddle of my sinnes." The tenth paragraph prays that "the glorious and ever Virgin Mary, Mother of God," may be "the chiefe executresse" of this testament, invoking also other saints his patrons. In the eleventh, his guardian angel is appealed to to be his protector "in the dreadfull day of judgement," and in the twelfth he makes suit to his surviving "friends, parents, and kinsfolks," to succour him in purgatory "with their holy prayers and satisfactory workes, especially with the holy sacrifice of the masse, as being the most effectuall means to deliver soules from their torments and paines." The two final paragraphs bequeath his soul to God and profess his readiness to accept of death in whatever shape and at whatever hour it may come, "beseeching Him above all things that He never permit any change to be made by me, John Shakespeare, of this my aforesaid will and testament." The document, after declaring the testator's perfect health of soul and body in making this "protestation, confession and charter," desires that it be buried with him after his death, and ends with the words:

Pater noster, Ave maria, Credo;
jesu, son of David, have mercy on me.

Amen.

Now it is well known that similar devotional formulæ, though they are for the most part shorter than that just summarized, were in common use among Catholics during the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. One example may be found in a little book called *The Exercise of the Christian Life* by Father Gaspar Loarte

Shakespeare Document

S.J., which was translated into English and printed as early as 1579. Another, quite different in form, occurs in a Benedictine manual entitled *A Dayly Exercise of the Devout Christian*, of which a fourth edition, dedicated to "Sir Henry Titchbourne, Baronet," was printed in 1685.

For this reason and still more from the internal evidence of the document itself, I had convinced myself some years ago that the text could not have been fabricated, at any rate, *de toutes pièces*, by an unlettered artisan like Jordan, who had no acquaintance with Catholicism.* It was, therefore, a matter of some satisfaction when, after long search, I at last stumbled upon the original of this curious paper. Strange to say, I met it first under conditions as remote as possible from any suggestion of Elizabethan recusancy. Happening to open a tiny booklet of half a dozen leaves, printed in the city of Mexico, A.D. 1661, I came upon the following title page:

TESTAMENTO O ULTIMA
VOLUNTAD DEL ALMA

hecho en Salud para assegurar el christiano de las tentaciones del Demonio, en la hora de la muerte; Ordenado por San Carlos Borromeo, Cardenal del Santa Praxedis, y Arçobispo de Milan.

(rude woodcut of the crucifixion)

Con licencia. En Mexico.

Por la Viuda de Bernardo Calderon, en la calle de San Agostino.
Año de 1661.†

A brief examination showed at once that the form therein printed was a Spanish version of the document which in Malone's copy was associated with the name of John Shakespeare. Every phrase in the English text—imperfect, it will be remembered, at the beginning—finds its counterpart in this Mexican leaflet. Let us take for illustration's sake the short paragraph numbered X in the paper sent to Malone.

* See *The Month*, November, 1911, "The Spiritual Testament of John Shakespeare."

† The Testament or Last Will of the Soul, made in health for the Christian to secure himself from the temptations of the devil at the hour of death, drawn up by St. Charles Borromeo, Cardinal of St. Praxedis and Archbishop of Milan. With licence. At Mexico by the widow of Bernard Calderon, St. Augustin's Street, 1661.

A Controverted

Item.—I John Shakspear do protest that I am willing, yea, I do infinitely desire and humbly crave, that of this my last will and testament the glorious and ever Virgin Mary, mother of God, refuge and advocate of sinners (whom I honour especially above all other saints), may be the chiefe Executresse, together with these other saints, my patrons, (Saint Winefride) all whome I invocke and beseech to be present at the hour of my death, that she and they may comfort me with their desired presence, and crave of sweet Jesus that he will receive my soul into peace.

Item, quiero, y desseo sumamente, y con toda pietad ruego, que de esta mi ultima voluntad, sea Protectora la gloriosa siempre Virgen MARIA, refugio y Abogada de los pecadores : à la qual especialmente, demas de los otros santos y santas, mis devotos, que son (N. N.) invoco, y llamo, que se hallen presentes à la hora de mi muerte ; y ruego à su Unigenito Hijo, que reciva mi espiritu en paz.

A specially interesting feature in this printed Spanish text is the occurrence of blank spaces left for the user to insert his name. The particular copy at the British Museum has been filled up in ink, now much faded, with the name of Juan Phelipe Hernandez, but in this Mexican form such blank spaces do not recur at the beginning of every separate paragraph, whereas in our English document the name is repeated in each. I may add that there is another copy of the same Spanish text, written throughout by hand, which is bound up in MS. Egerton 443, also at the British Museum. This copy was apparently made before the year 1690 by some professional scribe for the use of one Maria Teresa de Cardenas, and it is interesting to note that, just as in the case of a legal instrument, the testatrix's name is not written by herself wherever it occurs, but only signed at the end and in the curtailed form "Maria Teresa de C."*

In both these specimens, however, as also in one other example printed in the Romansch dialect at Barraduz

* I am not sure whether the scrawl which I have read as standing for the letters "de C." may not be simply a flourish of the pen.

Shakespeare Document

(Switzerland) in 1741, St. Charles Borromeo is named as the author of the formula.

None the less the ascription to the great Cardinal Archbishop of Milan seems to be by no means certain. In the *Life of St. Alessandro Sauli*, by Father Bianchi (Bianchi died at the beginning of last century and has since been beatified), a copy of the Italian text of the same document has been printed as an appendix.

Seeing that a short specimen was given above to illustrate the conformity of the English with the Spanish text, it may be interesting to set down another brief section of the English side by side with what appears to be the Italian original. Paragraph XIII will conveniently serve our purpose :

Item.—I John Shakspear doe by this my will and testament bequeath my soul, as soon as it shall be delivered and loosened from the prison of this my body, to be entombed in the sweet and amorous coffin of the side of Jesus Christ ; and that in this life-giving sepulcher it may rest and live, perpetually inclosed in that eternall habitation of repose there to blesse for ever and ever that direfull iron of the launce which, like a charge in a censure,* formes so sweet and pleasant a monument within the sacred breast of my lord and saviour.

Voglio e lascio che l'anima mia, subito sciolta da questo carcere terreno, sia sepolta nell' amorosa caverna del Costato di Gesù Cristo, nella quale vivifica sepoltura giaccia e viva perpetuamente confinata in quella requie e riposo, col benedire mille volte quel ferro della lancia che a guisa di scalpello pungente fece un monumento così dolce nell' amato petto del mio Signore.†

Now St. Charles Borromeo died in 1584. He seems to have met Alessandro Sauli for the first time in 1557 and to have placed himself in some sense under his spiritual guidance in 1568.‡ There is, therefore, no sort of reason

* Malone, as we shall see, has here misread the text before him. He complains in a letter that " the ink is very faint and some of the words almost obliterated," so that he cannot be sure of the reading.

† F. S. M. Bianchi, *Vita del Beato Alessandro Sauli*. I quote from the edition printed at Bologna in 1878, p. 152 ; but the *Life* itself is very much older. ‡ See A. Dubois, *Saint Alexandre Sauli*, Paris, 1904, pp. 77-81.

A Controverted

why the formula should not have been familiar to St. Charles in 1570, or even earlier, in any case long before that occasion when, in 1580, he entertained for a week together at Milan Fathers Campion and Parsons and the other missionaries who were on their way to England. Under these circumstances it is quite possible, and even probable, that an English rendering of the spiritual testament was circulating among the Catholics in Warwickshire some twenty years before the death of John Shakespeare (September, 1601).

It clearly follows from this that no chronological difficulty stands in the way of our identifying the person named in our English copy of the document with the poet's father. I do not in any case say that he wrote it out himself. The fact that he so frequently attested the town records and other papers of a formal nature by merely affixing his mark, indicates probably a certain disinclination for the effort of penmanship, though, if I mistake not, the best Shakespeare authorities, such as Sir Sidney Lee and Mrs. Stopes, are now satisfied that it does not prove that he was unable to write. The moment we realize that this profession of faith was looked upon as a kind of devotional formula, we shall no more expect to find it a holograph, than we expect to find the text of an ordinary will written in the testator's own hand. But the scribe who officiated in such a case might well have been a priest, a fact which would also help to explain the unusual correctness of the orthography.* Moreover, it is highly unlikely that any names of witnesses would have been introduced unnecessarily into what was, under the conditions of the time, a very compromising document. That John Shakespeare should read it, or repeat it aloud after the priest's dictation, would probably have been accounted as complete an authentication as was desirable. In any case it must not be forgotten that Malone never saw the first leaf of the manuscript. If John Shakespeare had affixed his mark there, that would surely have sufficed.

* A foreign education tended, I think, to foster a greater uniformity of spelling than was customary in England.

Shakespeare Document

There was no reason to treat this devotional formula as if it were a legal instrument the validity of which was liable to be contested in the courts unless each sheet was separately signed. A very important element in the case is, of course, the undisputed fact that in 1592 John Shakespeare's name appears in a list of "recusants, heretofore presented, who are thought to forbear the church for debt and fear of process, or for some other worse faults, or for age, sickness or impotence of body." There is evidence that this plea of "fear of process" was used by Catholics to evade the obligation of attending service in the parish church, and it seems quite possible that to give colour to the pretext collusive suits were sometimes arranged between such recusants and their complacent neighbours. John Shakespeare's application for a grant of arms in 1596 is not easily reconcilable with any very desperate condition of his finances.

It may well be, then, that the five leaves of faded writing which Mosely found under the tiling contained the genuine profession of faith of John Shakespeare, as Malone at first believed. But even if no more than a certain probability can be claimed for this view, the identification of the original of the document throws an interesting light upon the shifty procedure of Mr. John Jordan. As will be shown directly, he is convicted thereby of having been at least in the wider sense of the term a forger. To understand this it is necessary to explain that Malone, while his second volume was still in the press, but after the testament (mutilated, of course, as it was, of its first leaf) had been printed off, got into communication with the Stratford wheelwright who had previously sent a copy of the document to the *Gentleman's Magazine*. It would seem that Jordan, probably through the Vicar, Dr. Davenport, had lent Malone a little volume of his collections regarding Shakespeare. There, among other matters, Malone found a copy of the spiritual testament, no longer defective at the beginning, but seemingly entire. Naturally he then addressed himself to Jordan direct and one or two of his

A Controverted

letters have been preserved. Writing on March 10th, 1790, he says :

You have inserted a copy of the religious testament of John Shakespeare, whom I believe to have been the poet's eldest brother. The original of this was, some time ago, transmitted to me by Mr. Davenport, but the first leaf was wanting, containing the first two articles and part of the third, in consequence of which I have been obliged to print it imperfect. On my writing to Stratford on this subject I understood that Mr. Hart said it wanted the first leaf *when originally found*; and Mr. Payton, I think, concurred in the same account. How, then, have you made a copy of the first two articles and part of the third? When was your copy made and from whom did you obtain the original? And did you some years ago send a copy of this paper to the printer of the *Gentleman's Magazine*?*

A fortnight later Malone writes again :

Sir. I received your packet safe by the coach, and request to know whether the first copy which you made of John Shakespeare's will, and which you have inserted in your small quarto book, was taken from the original found by Joseph Mosely, or from a copy made by him or any other person, and whether the leaf which Mosely gave you shortly before his death, containing the first and second articles, was of the same size, and written in the same manner with the rest. The few leaves which were sent to me were very small, tacked together by a thread; the size the eighth part of a sheet, and the upper part of the last page but one almost illegible.†

The replies to these queries must have been sufficiently plausible; for the correspondence ended by Malone's printing on a later page the introductory part of the testament from Jordan's pretended copy.‡ It begins as follows :

In the name of God, the father, sonne, and holy ghost, the most holy and blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, the holy host of

* Halliwell, *Jordan Correspondence*, p. 8. † *Ibid.*, p. 11.

‡ Jordan stated in a letter to Malone, which Halliwell had seen and quotes (*Outlines*, II, p. 401), that this first leaf was "very much worn and torn," when Mosely a few months before his death at last found it and allowed it to be copied. Being the outer leaf it was more liable to injury, and it is just conceivable that Jordan really may have been able to decipher very little, and only guessed at the contents. His dishonesty might to some extent be palliated by such a supposition, but the story sounds improbable.

Shakespeare Document

archangels, angels, patriarchs, prophets, evangelists, apostles, saints, martyrs and all the celestial court and company of heaven, I John Shakspear, an unworthy member of the holy Catholick religion, being at this my present [writing in perfect health of body and sound mind, memory and understanding, but calling to mind the uncertainty of life and certainty of death, and that I may possibly be cut off in the blossome of my sins and called to render an account of all my transgressions externally and internally, and that I may be unprepared for the dreadful trial either by sacrament, pennance, fasting or prayer, or any other purgation whatever, do in the holy presence above specified, of my own free and voluntary accord, make and ordaine this my last spiritual will, testament, confession, protestation and confession of faith, hoping hereby to receive pardon for all my sinnes and offences and thereby to be made partaker of life everlasting.

Whether this was an entire invention of Jordan's, or whether the first leaf had really been found with the rest and he had only been able to gather the vaguest impression of its contents, it is impossible now to determine. Certain it is, in any case, that his text differs widely from the Italian and Spanish copies. The divergence is so great, that it seems worth while, if only for the curiosity of the matter, to translate the original. The Mexican copy is the oldest I have seen, and it begins with a simple cross ✕, such a cross as John Shakespeare might have made for himself and treated as his mark.

PREAMBLE (*Cabeza*) OF THE TESTAMENT.

The dangers to which human life is exposed being countless, and I, Juan Phelipe Hernandez, knowing that I am a mortal man, born only to die, without knowledge of the hour at which this debt will have to be discharged, in order that I may not be taken unprepared [and that my flight may not be in winter or on the sabbath day, as our Saviour says in the gospel]* have taken thought with the divine aid to prepare myself for that uncertain hour, since God now gives me the time; and so with my whole heart being prostrate before the feet of Christ our Lord, as He hangs upon the cross, I declare unto the world my last will in the following form.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

* This clause in square brackets does not occur in the Italian.

A Controverted

In the first place as the foundation of all salvation, I, Juan Phelipe Hernandez, declare and confess in the presence of Almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three Persons in one God, of the most holy Virgin and all the Court of Heaven, that I wish to live and die obedient to the Holy Roman Church, firmly believing all the fourteen articles of the Faith* taught by the holy Apostles, all the interpretations and declarations made upon them by the Holy Catholic Church, and all that the same Catholic Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, has taught, defined and declared.

The Catholic tone of this is unmistakable and very different from Jordan's vague platitudes. But the conclusive proof of that worthy's bad faith is supplied by the third paragraph, where the new matter he furnishes joins on to the old text which Malone himself had copied from the five small leaves first sent him. I mark the point of junction by a double bar:

Item. I John Shakespear doe by this present protest and declare, that as I am certain I must passe out of this transitory life into another that will last to eternity, I do hereby most humbly implore and intreat my good and guardian angell to instruct me in this my solemn preparation, protestation and confession of faith || at least spiritually in will adoring and most humbly beseeching my saviour that he will be pleased to assist me in so dangerous a voyage, to defend me from the snares and deceites of my infernall enemies and to conduct me to the secure haven of his eternall blisse.

The first part of this says nothing. It is, at best, sheer tautology; for an appeal to the angel guardian is made in section XI. But the original third paragraph speaks of what must be a petition of vital moment to every earnest Catholic, a point which would otherwise have been entirely overlooked.

Item. I protest in this same form that at the end of life I desire to receive the most holy Viaticum, in order to unite me perfectly and peacefully with my Lord Jesus Christ by means of so divine a Sacrament; the which if by some accident I should be unable then to receive, I now declare in view of that time that it is my purpose to receive it || at least spiritually in will, adoring and most humbly beseeching my Saviour, etc.

* The Italian says *twelve* articles.

Shakespeare Document

The Catholic reader, familiar with the idea of a "spiritual communion," will at once perceive how the words "at least spiritually in will" tack on to the idea of the reception of the Holy Eucharist by way of *Viaticum*, and how naturally the subsequent mention of "a dangerous voyage" links up with the same conception of provision for a journey. It is, therefore, I venture to say, absolutely certain that the original third paragraph in the English version agreed closely with the Spanish and Italian text and that, what Jordan has supplied is a clumsy invention of his own.

But, it will be urged, if he was capable of this, was he not also capable of fabricating the whole, at least so far as regards the introduction of Shakespeare's name? In view of the facts which are known to us, this bolder imposture seems to me unlikely. When Jordan sent a copy of the document to the *Gentleman's Magazine* in June, 1784, he declared that the original had been given him by Mosely (Mosely being then alive), he also stated that "two sentences and a half" (obviously he means paragraphs) had been lost at the beginning, and he further professed his readiness to show the original to anyone they might send to inspect it.* If this was bluff, it was a very audacious kind of bluff. Halliwell says that the will was Jordan's own composition, but, obviously, the wheelwright could not have invented the text of a document which existed in Italian and Spanish a hundred or even two hundred years before his time. On the forgery theory we have to suppose that he had found an English translation of this distinctively Catholic testament, that he copied it out again in archaic writing, inserting in twelve places the name of John Shakespeare, and that he did his work so skilfully that Malone, the prime detector of forgeries, though he had the five little leaves in his hands for months and wrote many times to make inquiries about them at Stratford, was completely imposed upon. How is it that a man who must have had quite a genius

* See J. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* (Ed. 1887), Vol. II, p. 399.

A Controverted

for counterfeiting ancient documents, simulating the obliterations of age, etc., at no time attempted anything else of the same kind after this first brilliant success? No doubt, he invented three paragraphs to replace the missing portion, but Malone never obtained from him anything but a *modern copy* of this, or of the "lowsie Lucy" ballad, or of the other dubious materials he supplied. We have, in fact, not a scrap of evidence to show that Jordan possessed any exceptional skill in penmanship. On the other hand, it is certain that in July, 1799, he was received by Malone with much friendliness, partaking of several meals at that gentleman's house in London.* Seeing that Malone's exposure of the Ireland forgeries and his repudiation of the will as the work of John Shakespeare, the poet's father, had taken place three years earlier, it seems clear that the critic, in spite of his change of mind, still acquitted Jordan of any imposture in connection with the document found under the tiling of the "birthplace."

To my thinking, then, it remains eminently probable that the story of the discovery by Mosely, the bricklayer, was the simple truth. Even if we supposed that Jordan tampered with the document, or contrived to produce some sort of tracing, inserting John Shakespeare's name, the very interesting fact remains that a Catholic formula of this kind was found hidden away in a house which the Shakespeares and the Harts had occupied for many generations. Various conjectures are possible, but one in particular has occurred to me which seems, at least, worthy of a passing notice. The house in which the discovery was made was certainly that in which the poet's sister, Joan Hart, *née* Shakespeare, lived until her death in 1646. Now the testament, in section X, names only one patron, St. Winefride, a female saint; whence it would be natural to infer that the form was originally copied for a woman. The name Joan, in Elizabethan times, was, of course, written in several different ways, Jone, Johnne,

* Jordan's letter to Mr. Payton describing his reception has been printed by Halliwell in his *Jordan Correspondence*, p. 49.

Shakespeare Document

Joane, etc.—if I mistake not, I have even seen it written John. It might well be, therefore, that the testament was originally transcribed for Joan Shakespeare in her girlhood. Whether Jordan, by a touch or two, thought it worth while to alter the name into John; or whether, as the spelling of the whole paper seems to suggest, the five leaves discovered by Mosely were only a copy of an older original, it is in either case possible that John Shakespeare's name has come to replace that of his daughter. I can readily conceive that somewhere about 1660 one of the Harts, finding the perishing original in an old drawer, might copy the paper just for the curiosity of the contents. There can be no doubt that at that date they held the name Shakespeare in much veneration. A son born in 1666, was christened Shakespeare Hart, and a generation later we find a William Shakespeare Hart. The substitution of John for Joan might in that case be a simple blunder of the copyist.

Three minor points remain to be noticed. The first is that when the testator asks his "friends, parents and kinsfolks" to pray for him, he is merely employing a careless translation of the Italian and Spanish text of the formula. The phrase "*amigos y parientes*" means simply friends and relatives, which does not necessarily assume the survival of the father and mother. Secondly, Malone, in a half-obliterated passage, has misread certain words which Jordan in his own copy* gives correctly. In Malone's printed text, reproduced above, we find the phrase "like a charge in a censore," which he himself was puzzled at, as one of his letters shows. Jordan, who probably saw the text when the ink was less faded, copies correctly "like a sharp-cutting razor." The Spanish is "*a modo de sincel agudo*," the Italian "*a guisa di scalpello pungente*." Lastly, there is one interesting word which both Malone and Jordan have mistaken. In paragraph IV, dealing with Extreme Unction, the testator according to Malone prays that God will be pleased to

* Halliwell has reproduced this copy in his *Original Collections of John Jordan*, etc., 1865.

A Controverted Shakespeare

"anoint my senses, internall and externall, with the oyle of His infinite mercy," and "to pardon me all my sins committed by seeing, speaking, *feeling*, smelling, hearing, touching," etc. For *feeling* Jordan reads *justing*, but undoubtedly the original word was neither *feeling* nor *justing*, but *gusting*, for in the ritual form of the Sacrament the priest when anointing the lips prays that God may forgive *quidquid per gustum et loquelam deliquisti*, i.e., the sins committed by "speaking and gusting" (tasting).

We shall probably never be able to dissipate the cloud of mystery in which this strange document is involved, but the whole history, when fairly considered, seems to me considerably to strengthen the presumption that the atmosphere of the household in which William Shakespeare was brought up was predominantly Catholic. This does not, of course, prove him personally to have belonged to that faith, but the fact ought not to be left out of account in any discussion of his religious views.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE SATIRISTS

THE tercentenary of the issue of the First Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays has brought with it, as was only to be expected, a plentiful crop of new books dealing in one way or another with the vexed question of the authorship of these immortal works. This constant supply of new writings, learned and ingenious many of them in their various ways, is eloquent testimony to the very real difficulties which stand in the way of any whole-hearted acceptance of the traditional authorship; difficulties which are only intensified, and in no respect cleared away by the minute investigations which are constantly being carried out in the hope of throwing fresh light on the subject. It still remains just as impossible as it was in the time of Emerson, "to marry the life to the works." The difficulty is not only, or even chiefly, to be found in the want of education of the actor from Stratford. Genius can do much, and it is always true that *Poeta nascitur, non fit*. But genius alone, even transcendent genius, will not account for the possession of technical knowledge, such as is only acquired by long and laborious study. And yet it is knowledge of this sort, not merely such as might reasonably be assigned to

Fancy's child
Warbling his native woodnotes wild,

which those who are themselves possessed of such technical knowledge tell us they detect in the Shakespeare plays. Great lawyers tell us that "his knowledge of legal terms is not merely such as might be acquired by the casual observation of even his all comprehending mind, but has the appearance of technical skill." Those, on the other hand, like Mr. J. M. Robertson or Mr. Andrew Lang, who have no special knowledge of law deny that anything of the kind is true. For myself, I am not so foolish as to meddle with the freemasonry of a profession of which I

Shakespeare and the Satirists

know so little. I express no opinion, but I should prefer to follow the judgment of those who ought to know, rather than of those who do not seem to have any better right than myself to express any opinion on the matter.

Exactly the same difficulty as exists in the matter of law, is to be found also in the classical allusions in the plays. Once again, scholars like Mr. Churton Collins are insistent on the signs of extensive knowledge of this kind, and those who themselves are innocent of any deep classical culture, not unnaturally do not show themselves alive to much of the evidence. Here, perhaps, my own opinion is worth more than it is in the matter of law or medicine, and, for myself, I cannot understand how such extensive knowledge, the knowledge of one widely read in classical literature, and by no means the knowledge which could be obtained by the cleverest of boys at the best of schools, can possibly be denied. I can only suspect that many of the critics pass the constant Latinisms by without recognizing either their origin or their meaning. Take, for instance, so obvious an example as "the harmless, necessary cat." How many readers of the play have any notion that Shakespeare had any deeper meaning than that cats were useful to catch mice? Or take, again, the constant use of words, not in their usual English meaning, but in some original Latin sense which has never established itself in our language. How many readers without reference, not to an English, but a Latin dictionary, could give offhand the meaning of such a passage as this :

Yet in this captious and intenable seive
I still pour in the water of my love.

—*All's Well*, 1, 3.

or explain this allusion :

Be candidatus then, and put it on.

—*Tit. Andr.*, 1, 1.

or this,

What maintenance he from his friend receives
Like exhibition shall thou have from me.

—*Two Gentlemen*, 1, 3.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

or this, still more strange to our ears :

It will please his grace (by the world) sometime to lean upon my poor shoulder and with his royal finger, thus, dally with my excrement, my mustachio.—*Love's Labour's Lost*, v, 1.

Nor, again, without some considerable study of philosophy, could any grammar-school boy have penned the following :

Sense sure you have,
Else could you not have motion.
—*Hamlet*, III, 4.

Here the best explanation for a non-philosophical reader would seem to be a reference to Lord Verulam's *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, which was published in the same year as the First Folio, 1623. There Lord Verulam explains that the doctrine which has hitherto been held generally by philosophers is no longer tenable. The passage was dropped from the play in the First Folio, though it appears in the Quartos. We have, therefore, the singular fact that in this abstruse question of technical philosophy, the untaught poet, since he must be held to have made the alteration before his death in 1616, anticipated the philosopher by at least seven years in coming to a definite conclusion that previous teaching, his own included, had all been wrong.

Instances such as these could be multiplied indefinitely, and that in many fields of knowledge, but after all, it is not here that many minds find their greatest difficulty in accepting the traditional authorship. They find it rather in those last sombre, sordid years of the actor-poet's life in his newly acquired home at Stratford. How is it conceivable that the world's greatest mind, the teacher not of his own century only, but of all succeeding time, can have settled down, at the age of 46, in company of an illiterate wife and an illiterate daughter, in a house which apparently contained no single book or manuscript, even of his own plays; in a village where, according to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, there were not more than a couple of dozen books, if so many, to be found among the whole

Shakespeare and the Satirists

population—"the most dirty, unseemly, ill-paved, wretched looking town in all Britain," as David Garrick describes it in 1769; seeing no visitors; writing no letters and receiving none, so far as any trace of such has come down to us; leaving no single scrap of his handwriting behind except five signatures of so illegible and illiterate a character that it is incredible that the plays can have been composed in such a script; chiefly engaged, as far as we can ascertain, in money lending on a small scale to his fellow townsmen, and bringing suits against them to recover even so small a sum as two shillings, while on another occasion, failing to recover from the debtor, he relentlessly pursued his bondsman for a whole year; leaving no tradition behind him in his native town except as to drinking bouts with neighbouring villagers, and the tree under which he lay all night in helpless drunkenness; how is it possible, we repeat, to reconcile such a life as this with the authorship of the greatest poetry that the world has seen and with the deep philosophy of life which still keeps his memory fresh and venerated everywhere. It is impossible "to marry the life to the works," "we hunger and we receive only husks; we open our mouths for food, and we break our teeth against these stones."*

It is not our purpose, however, in the present article to deal with the question of authorship, and still less to make surmises as to who, in default of the actor from Stratford, has best claims to be a candidate for the vacated place. We desire to confine ourselves to a single question. What did contemporary literary opinion think of the matter in Shakespeare's own lifetime? Did the difficulty weigh as heavily on them as it does on us? Or is it true, as Mr. Andrew Lang would have us believe, and as Mr. Garvin has just lately, with characteristic conviction, once more informed the world, that Shakespeare's "literary contemporaries, working with him in the closest intimacy, had no doubt about him; that he was famous in his early career; that afterwards for twenty years

* R. Grant White, *Memoirs of Shakespeare*, p. 88.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

and more he was regarded as a man of surpassing genius in an age of genius, and that at his death he was praised without question as the glory of the land."

It is easy enough, no doubt, for a journalist, writing in the irresponsible columns of his own Sunday newspaper, to be thus positive, and there are many who are pleased as they read it. But it would be difficult to pen a sentence with less basis in the actual records of the time. It was a small but very brilliant literary London in which Shakespeare must have lived. If the above account of him is true, he must have been known to all, or nearly all, of that marvellous circle. Yet in his own lifetime and for seven years after his death there is scarcely one single mention of his name, apart from the plays or poems, anywhere to be met with. No one claims to have seen him, to have spoken with him, even to have heard of him. We are told he was an actor, but we know no theatre whose boards he certainly trod, no play in which he certainly acted, no part which he sustained, no line that he spoke. We have no writing from his pen, and no description of his appearance. No one can tell whether he was bald or hirsute, clean shaved or bearded, dark or fair, tall and thin like Irving or round and fat-paunched like his own Falstaff. The vacuous face of the First Folio portrait is said by Ben Jonson "to out-doe the life." It shows him clean shaven, though apparently in want of a shave. But his funeral bust at Stratford gives him a beard. Nor are the two heads representative, apparently, of the same man. A fancy likeness, based on no authentic data, has been invented to represent him in a guise more pleasing to modern taste, and is recognized by every child as "Shakespeare," but it has no resemblance to either of these which alone have any claim to be true likenesses of the man. He passes away at Stratford, sunk in such obscurity that his death called forth no sort of comment from any writer, nor was thought worthy even of casual mention in a newsletter or private diary. He dies as he has lived, in complete isolation and apparently entirely forgotten by the literary world. Not until seven years

Shakespeare and the Satirists

have passed away does he receive the belated but very full recognition which informs us that in him England had lost "the Starre of Poets," "the Poets' King," one who in his works had outdone "all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome sent forth," "to whom all scenes of Europe homage owe." With that recognition he comes suddenly at one bound into the position he has held ever since, but there is no record whatever to tell us that any single being thought thus of him while he was still alive.

In the year 1592 there appeared, for the first time, so far as we know, upon a title page the name of William Shake-speare, thus spelt, which was from that time forward to be so famous. It had been connected, no doubt, at an even earlier date with unprinted plays, but as Mr. Andrew Lang has pointed out, no one cares much who may be the author of a successful play, and the name, up to that point, had, perhaps, not become known outside of a very limited circle. Now it appeared on the title page of a poem which at once took London by storm, and of which one edition after another was called for. The poem was called *Venus and Adonis*, and it was dedicated to the young Earl of Southampton, who at that time was a member of Gray's Inn, as also were Francis Bacon and William Stanley, the brother of the Earl of Derby, soon himself to succeed to the title. It had the imprimatur, rather surprisingly for a poem of that character, of Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury (who had been tutor to the two young Bacons at Trinity College, Cambridge, a few years before), and of the Bishop of London. How the young Will Shakspeare, at that time still little known and but five years or so up from Stratford, succeeded in obtaining such an imprimatur for his love-poem is not very clear. But so it was, the poem appeared under these high auspices, went, as I have said, into one edition after another, and became the favourite reading of the maids of honour at Elizabeth's Court and also, it was said, of other ladies of far less exalted position and of even easier virtue.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

In 1596, at Cambridge, Joseph Hall, a young man of very great promise and ability, destined later to be a shining light of the Anglican Church as Bishop of Norwich, was elected to a fellowship at the newly founded College of Emmanuel. He had literary leanings, and felt, like Hamlet, that the times in which he lived were sadly "out of joint." So he determined to be "the first English Satirist," after the model of Juvenal and of Persius, and to lash in verse the vices which he so much disapproved. To this purpose he published his *Virgidemiae*, or Bundle of Rods, which attacks in turn all the fashionable "Sins of Society" under feigned names. The great object, of course, was to hit in each case upon a name, the application of which to the individual attacked would be clear to every reader, while at the same time it was not so obvious as to make it possible, or at any rate easy, to bring the libel home to its perpetrator.

Now, in the 2nd Book of these Satires the person attacked is named Labeo, and he occupies a great deal of space. Obviously Labeo's book, for he is a writer, is one of some importance. As we read on we soon realize that it is the poem *Venus and Adonis* that is being castigated. We have the introductory invocation of Apollo, how Phœbus filled him with intelligence, the *ob's* and the *but's* which begin so many stanzas, the double adjectives of what was then the newest fashion, lately introduced from France by Sir Philip Sidney, "for adjectives cannot stand alone." Later on we have allusions to other of Shakespeare's works—the armies wading in blood in *Titus Andronicus*, and we are told that there were earlier works of a pastoral character. These, however, are not selected for punishment, but only *Venus and Adonis*, and this for its lascivious character. Labeo, it is admitted, "has written wondrous well," but still:

For shame, write better, Labeo, or write none.
Or better write, or, Labeo, write alone.

and again :

For shame, write cleanly, Labeo, or, write none.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

The writer of *Venus and Adonis*, therefore, in Hall's opinion at any rate, was not "writing alone." He was either writing in collaboration with another, which would seem the most natural interpretation of the words, or else under shelter of another's name. This last interpretation would seem far-fetched, were it not that Hall, returning to the attack the following year in a later book of the same *Satires*, makes it clear that it is the true one.

Labeo is whipt, and laughs me in the face!
Why? for I smite and hide the gallèd place.

Who list complain of wrongèd faith or fame
When he may shift it to another's name.

Labeo, then, is the real author, but he is using "another's name." Like "the crafty Cuttle," "he lieth sure," himself in safe hiding

In the black Cloude of his own Vomiture.

He is not really William Shake-speare at all, that is "another's name," and the real culprit escapes altogether because by the forbearance of the satirist he is able to "hide the gallèd place."

Who, then, is Labeo? At whom is the Satire directed? The whole point of the poem depends on this being easily recognized by its readers.

Cambridge, at any rate, can have had no doubt upon that point, for it was one of her own sons, well known, no doubt, to all at least of the older men, for his had been a noteworthy academic career, and though he had never taken a degree he had kept in close touch with his College and University. And the allusion to his career contained in the name Labeo was too obvious to be missed by any in a University which still read the Classics, and in which Roman Law was a principal subject of study with a large number.

Labeo, as we learn from Horace and Tacitus, was a great lawyer in the days of Augustus, perhaps the greatest

Shakespeare and the Satirists

name in all the earlier days of Roman Law. He by no means confined himself to legal studies, but was a learned man in other fields of knowledge. He aimed at high place in political life, but fell into disfavour with Augustus through a speech in the Senate. In consequence he was passed over for the Consulship, which was given to his great rival, Ateius Capito. In the words of Tacitus it was his *incorrupta libertas* which was the obstacle to his political advancement.

Francis Bacon, like Labeo a lawyer and the son of a lawyer, resembled him also in the breadth of his intellectual interests. He "took all knowledge to be his province." He, too, desired advancement in political life, but he had given, by a speech in the Commons in 1593 on the subject of the Subsidy, four years before the publication of this Satire, deep and well-nigh ineradicable offence to Elizabeth. In consequence of this, in the following year, 1594, he had been passed over for the appointment of Attorney-General, after a struggle with his great rival Edward Coke, which had set all England talking. The names of the two competitors had given rise to many cheap witticisms. "Men thought at first that the Bacon would prove too hard for the Cook, but in the end the Cook was able to dish the Bacon," in spite of all the influence that Essex and other friends could bring to affect the issue.

No one in Cambridge could have missed the parallel. The new Fellow of Emmanuel had been rash enough to point his finger straight at Francis Bacon, to accuse him, in a way which everyone could understand, of being the real author whose work was appearing under the name of William Shake-speare, and to bid him in the plainest language:

Either write cleanly, Labeo, or write none,

And most men will have felt that the rash satirist had only got what he asked for when his book was ordered by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to be burnt, though the sentence was afterwards altered, and the book was only "staid at the press."

Shakespeare and the Satirists

Cambridge had spoken out and been silenced for her pains. What was young Oxford thinking?

John Marston took his degree from Brasenose in the same year as Joseph Hall took his from Emmanuel, but, perhaps because he was not of the same solidity of character as the future Bishop of Norwich, he was not elected to a Fellowship. He was fired, however, by a like ambition, and if Hall was determined to be "the first English Satirist," Marston was close at his heels and eager to be the second. So in this same year 1597 he published his first book under the title of *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image and certaine Satyres*. The spelling of Pigmalion with an "i" is kept up throughout, though the book was duly registered at the Stationers' Company with the proper spelling. Modern editors, often a little flat-footed, for the most part spell the title in the classical way, correcting what they apparently consider an obvious blunder of the author. But Brasenose was not really so illiterate a place, and Marston was quite a good scholar and knew what he was doing. The point of his careful mis-spelling is brought out in his concluding stanza. The whole poem is a take-off on *Venus and Adonis*, written in the same metre, but, naturally, on a far lower level of poetry. It ends as follows:

So Labeo did complain his love was stone,
Obdurate, flinty so relentless none.

The quotation from *Venus and Adonis* is plain enough (lines 200-01) and by the use of the name *Labeo* he associates himself directly with the Cambridge attack. The point of the *Pigmalion* spelling will be more clear if we remember that in the Sixteenth Century the term *bacon* was not restricted as it is at present, but was used interchangeably with *hog* and *pig* to denote the animal itself.

In this way Marston had made it clear that he, too, was of Hall's opinion and held that William Shakespeare was but a name for Francis Bacon, but he went on to put the matter beyond all dispute in the "Satyres" which

Shakespeare and the Satirists

follow the introductory poem. His fourth Satire is entitled *Reactio* and in it he defends one after another the victims whom Hall had attacked. He affects to be shocked at Hall's daring and expostulates with him for having aimed so high. "What," he says :

Not *mediocria firma* from thy spite.

—*Sat.*, iv, 77.

that is to say, literally, "Was not even mediocrity safe from your spiteful attack?" But he had a deeper meaning than this. *MEDIOCRIA FIRMA* was the motto of the Bacon family. It was well known to all, for the Lord Keeper had always used it, and Francis Bacon himself used it to the end of his days. It is round his portrait, for instance, in the original edition of the *Sylva Sylvarum*. Nor has it ever been used by any other family. There was proof clear enough, if anyone still needed it, as to who was meant to be pointed at by the name of Labeo. It was unmistakable already by any scholar and especially by any who knew his Roman Law, but Marston dots the i's and crosses the t's and makes it clear even to the man in the street, for everyone in those days who had any pretensions at all to gentility had some acquaintance with heraldry and would recognize the mottos of the great.

Marston's book was ordered to be burned at the same time as Hall's, and the order was not in this case retracted. The book was burned in the garden of Stationers' Hall on June 4th, 1599.

Oxford had spoken and given in her agreement with Cambridge, in thinking that William Shakespeare was Francis Bacon. What did London say? How about Ben Jonson? At this period he was a young man, just about the age of Hall and of Marston, rapidly rising in literary fame, although not a University man, but as yet "Maister of Artes of neither University." We could find no one better qualified to be the spokesman of young literary circles in the capital city. We all know what was his opinion a quarter of a century later and how he voiced

Shakespeare and the Satirists

it in the First Folio. What did he think in 1598? What did the name "William Shake-speare" mean to him then?

We have his answer in the first act of the *Poetaster*, a play which was not brought out until 1604, and then with an ending quite out of all continuity with the beginning. In 1598 Ben Jonson had had a misfortune. He killed a man in a duel and in consequence was "put away" for some years. He got his liberty again, and apparently finished up the play he had begun long before, though the subject of the first act was now rather out of date. If we may judge by internal evidence, that first act was written in 1598 and carries on the attack on Bacon, as the author of *Venus and Adonis*, begun at Cambridge by Hall, and continued in Oxford and London by John Marston.

The play opens with young Ovid seated at his desk and engaged in poetical composition. He is writing, oddly enough, precisely that portion of the *Metamorphoses* from which Shake-speare had selected the motto he placed at the head of his poem.

Vilia miretur vulgus ; mihi flavus Apollo
Pocula Castalia plena ministrat aqua.

Suddenly his labours are broken in upon by the entrance of "Luscus," whom later on we discover to be a player and to be meant quite obviously for one particular player, just then in the public eye, namely, William Shakspeare. "They forget they are in the statute ; the rascals," is what is said of him after he has left the room, "they are blazoned there ; there they are tricked, they and their pedigrees ; they need no other heralds, I wiss." That allusion is unmistakable: there was only one player on the London stage who was anxious to be accounted a gentleman, and had actually made application in 1596 to the Herald's College for a grant of arms to his father, making, according to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, ridiculous statements about the claims of his family, both on the father's and the mother's side. There were constant

Shakespeare and the Satirists

allusions to this in the plays and satires of the period, and to it he seems to have owed the appellation which we so constantly meet with of "gentle Shakspeare." "Luscus," then, must be taken to be William Shakspeare the actor, and his object in rushing in is to warn young Ovid that his father is coming. "Young Master, Master Ovid, do you hear? Gods a'me! Away with your songs and sonnets, and on with your gown and cap quickly; here, here, your father will be a man of this room presently. . . . Get a law book in your hand . . . this villainous poetry will undo you, by the welkin." However, Ovid will not listen to him and Luscus goes out in despair of influencing him, to return soon after in the company of old Ovid, the father, and two companions. The old man just hears his son declaiming the last line he has written:

My name shall live, and my best part aspire.

Ovid, sen.—"Your name shall live." Indeed, sir, you say true; but how infamously, how scorned and contemned in the eyes and ears of the best and gravest Romans? That you think not on; you never so much as dream of that. Are these the fruits of all my travail and expenses? Is this the scope and aim of thy studies? Are these the hopeful courses, wherewith I have so long flattered my expectations from thee? Verses? Poetry? Ovid, whom I thought to see the pleader, become Ovid the play-writer!

Ovid, jun.—No, sir.

Ovid, sen.—Yes, sir. I hear of a tragedy of yours coming forth for the common players there called "Medea." By my household gods, if I come to the acting of it, I'll add one tragic part, more than is yet expected, to it; believe me when I promise it. What! Shall I have my son a stager now? an ingler for players? a gull, a rook, a shot-clog to make suppers and be laughed at? Publius, I will set thee on the funeral pyre first.

The scene goes on for some time in this way. "Luscus" is abused as a "stinkard" and "ragamuffin rascal" and sent off to get the horses ready. Meanwhile young Ovid tries to defend himself.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

Ovid, jun.—They wrong me, sir, and do abuse you more,
That blow your ears with these untrue reports.
I am not known unto the open stage,
Nor do I traffic in their theatres.

Sir, let me crave, you will forego these moods ;
I will be anything, or study anything.

And so on. The whole act needs to be read, and read carefully. It is full of allusions which were obviously clear enough to the audience, if not to us. Each of the characters was apparently a "take off," more or less obvious, of some well known personage of the day, whose mannerisms were no doubt introduced by the actor, so as to make the whole thing more unmistakable. Old Ovid may very well be Burleigh, but in that case this first act must have been written not later than 1598, for he died in that year. In the light of the allusions in the *Satires of Hall and Marston*, which show plainly that Bacon was credited in common gossip, at least in literary circles, with being the author who, under the name of William Shakespeare, had published the poems of *Venus and Adonis* and the *Rape of Lucrece*, it seems impossible not to identify Bacon also with young Ovid. The poem alluded to is certainly that of *Venus and Adonis*, the quotation from the *Metamorphoses* proves that. What other young lawyer can be suggested as being meant by young Ovid? Certainly it is not William Shakspeare of Stratford, the actor, who is thus portrayed. Who is it, if it is not Francis Bacon?

We learn from an "Apologetical Dialogue" which follows the play, and which was written for the stage though only once spoken there, that the author had been accused that he had

taxed

The law and lawyers, captains, and the players,
By their particular names.

So the allusion must have been pretty obvious and generally understood. The author defends himself by saying:

Shakespeare and the Satirists

It is not so,
I used no name. My books have still been taught
To spare the persons and to speak the vices,

and expresses his intention for the future :

since the Comic Muse
Hath proved so ominous to me, I will try
If Tragedy have a more kind aspect.

He had provoked, as he says :

the angry wasps
That they fly buzzing, mad, about my nostrils,
And like so many screaming grasshoppers
Held by the wings, fill every ear with noise.

It was no wonder, indeed, that the victims had been irritated if we consider the precise method Jonson had employed. No one, indeed, was named, but each character suggested its original to the audience. No one was fairly treated ; the introduction of discreditable and obviously untrue characteristics served the double purpose of stinging more keenly and providing at the same time a useful line of defence. Thus "Luscus" in this play is obviously Shakspeare—but it is a Shakspeare far meaner, lower, more despicable than the real one. Ovid jun. is obviously, I think, Bacon ; but it is the Bacon of the past rather than a portrait of the moment ; for Bacon in 1598 was out of tutelage and already "waxing somewhat old" at 37. So again, Crispinus later on in the play is mainly an attack on John Marston, but the hyphen in the name has obvious connection with that in the name Shake-speare. Tucça, the military braggart, is clearly a take-off on some well known figure of the moment whose mannerisms are caricatured, but he is very likely compounded of two or more. So also it may be with others, but the clues by which they could be recognized have long since been lost.

It is clear, however, that Francis Bacon did feel himself aggrieved, and did take Ovid jun. to be meant for himself. He may or may not have been annoyed by the insinuation that he was the real author of the Shake-speare plays and

Shakespeare and the Satirists

poems. What really stung him was the accusation made by Tucca in the play, that his was "a cheveril conscience," meaning apparently that like a kid glove it could be stretched to cover anything. Now Bacon, unlike most, was in a position to bite as well as bark. The three chief permanent members of the Star Chamber were the Lord Keeper, the Lord Treasurer and the Archbishop of Canterbury. He was the son of a Lord Keeper, the nephew of a Lord Treasurer, and the pupil of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Moreover, he himself held the reversion to the Clerkship, though it had not yet fallen in. Undoubtedly he had influence with the Star Chamber and could quite possibly make good his threats of proceeding in that Court. Ben Jonson replied to them with an epigram, which at a later date he published:

EPIGRAM LIV

Cheveril cries out my verses libels are ;
And threatens the Star-Chamber and the Bar.
What are thy petulant pleadings, Cheveril, then,
That quit'st the cause so oft, and rail'st at men ?

Bacon replied apparently with deeds, for we find Ben in prison in 1605 "for a play." But, before or after this we cannot tell, he issued another epigram, and in it so arranged his lines as to make it quite clear whom he was attacking and yet still not to "use the name":

EPIGRAM XXXVII

On Cheveril the Lawyer

No cause, nor client fat, will Cheveril leese
But as they come, on both sides he takes fees,
And pleaseth both ; for while he melts his grease
For this ; that wins, for whom he holds his peace.

The acrostic reads from the bottom upwards, and is marked by the lines. It is ingenious, for it could easily be disowned, and yet, as every mathematician knows, eight letters do not in practice arrange themselves in order so as to be read, and give a meaning. The "o" in "For," being a cipher, is to be ignored, as is frequently done in such compositions of the time.

Shakespeare and the Satirists

There is a great deal more of similar evidence available in Elizabethan literature, pointing in the same direction. Of course, by itself it proves nothing. It only shows what literary men were saying and thinking at the moment, and that Miss Delia Bacon in the middle of the last century was very far from being the first person to whom the idea had occurred. So far as Ben Jonson is concerned it may fairly be answered that since we know he afterwards changed his mind, and gave us his final and mature opinion in 1623 in the First Folio, it is of no great interest to trace his earlier and mistaken surmises. But the whole question of what Ben Jonson really thought, and when, if ever, he changed his mind, is a very much more difficult one than is generally realized. There, I think, one touches the really important and decisive evidence on the whole question. At some future time, if the Editor will give me space, I shall hope to discuss this most fascinating and intricate problem in the pages of this Review.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

THE SPIRITUAL CANTICLE

OF ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS

THE sublime poem of the Spiritual Canticle was written by St. John of the Cross in 1578, when under detention in the Convent of the Carmelite Friars at Toledo as a rebel. In the ordinary language of love, under guise of a dialogue between two lovers, it tells of the love between the bride-soul and its Bridegroom, Christ, and it portrays in masterly fashion the different states through which the soul passes, dwelling very fully on the exalted state known to mystical writers as the spiritual betrothal, and culminating in the highest form of union between God and the soul possible on earth, the spiritual marriage. As with the Canticle of Canticles, so with this great Canticle, the spiritual meaning is not obvious to the generality, and only partially so to the initiate, and the Ven. Anne of Jesus, the greatest perhaps of St. Teresa's daughters, asked St. John to write an explanatory commentary on it. This he did, if reluctantly, completing the work in 1584, seven years before his death.

Three versions of the Spiritual Canticle with its commentary are known to us. The first version appeared for the first time in a French dress at Paris in 1622. The translation is the work of René Gaultier, *conseiller du roi*, who did much to help in introducing the Carmelite Reform into France. The same version next appeared at Brussels in 1627, but in its original Spanish. These are the only two printed editions known of the first version, and are the only two in which the Canticle with its commentary has been printed separately from the Saint's principal treatises.*

* The first edition of St. John's *Obras espirituales* appeared at Alcalá in 1618, and the second at Barcelona in 1619. Neither contained the Spiritual Canticle.

The Spiritual Canticle

The second version appeared for the first time in an Italian edition of St. John's works printed at Rome, also in 1627. It differs from the first chiefly in this, that another stanza with commentary has been added. The first version had thirty-nine stanzas only; in the second, Stanza II now appears for the first time, making forty stanzas altogether. There are many but not important differences between the first version (which I will call A) and the second (which I will call Aa,) but the order of the stanzas is the same in both. The second version first appeared in Spanish at Madrid in 1630, and all subsequent editions of the Saint's works, Spanish, Italian, French, Flemish, German, Latin, followed this redaction till the end of the Seventeenth Century.

In the famous edition of St. John's works printed at Seville in 1703, the version of the Spiritual Canticle differed greatly from A and Aa. Extensive additions have been made to the commentary, while nearly half the stanzas appear in a totally different order from the previous versions. This new version was taken by the editor, Fray Andrés de Jesús, from a MS., then, as now, in the possession of the Carmelite nuns of Jaen, which until recently was erroneously believed to be in the handwriting of the Saint. The editor, I understand, has been none too exact in the work of transcription. All subsequent editions of the Canticle, whether in the original or translated, have been taken from the Seville version. Fray Gerardo, O.C.D., however, in the critical edition of St. John's works, has faithfully reproduced the Jaen MS., one of the many advantageous services rendered by this important publication.* I will refer to this version as B.

The following table shows the differences in the order of the stanzas in A and B. Aa follows the order of A, except that like B it has Stanza II. Right throughout this article, in referring to the stanzas of A I shall use Arabic numerals, and for the stanzas of B I shall use Roman numerals.

* *Obras del Místico Doctor San Juan de la Cruz*. Edición crítica. By Fray Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz. Toledo, 1912-14. Three vols. I refer to this edition throughout by the initials E.C.

The Spiritual Canticle

<i>A compared with B</i>				<i>B compared with A</i>			
I	I	I	I
2	II	II	2
3	III	III	3
4	IV	IV	4
5	V	V	5
6	VI	VI	6
7	VII	VII	7
8	VIII	VIII	8
9	IX	IX	9
10	X	X	10
—	XI	XI	—
11	XII	XII	11
12	The spiritual	XIII	XIII	XIII	The spiritual		12
13	} betrothal begins	XIV	XIV	XIV	} betrothal be-		13
14	here ...	XV	XV	XV	gins here		14
15	...	XXIV	XVI	XVI	25
16	...	XXV	XVII	XVII	26
17	...	XXVI	XVIII	XVIII	31
18	...	XXVII	XIX	XIX	32
19	...	XXVIII	XX	XX	29
20	...	XXIX	XXI	XXI	30
21	...	XXX	XXII	XXII	Spiritual mar-		27
22	...	XXXI	XXIII	XXIII	riage begins		28
23	...	XXXII	XXIV	XXIV	here ...		15
24	...	XXXIII	XXV	XXV	16
25	...	XVI	XXVI	XXVI	17
26	...	XVII	XXVII	XXVII	18
27	Spiritual marriage	XXII	XXVIII	XXVIII	19
28	begins here	XXIII	XXIX	XXIX	20
29	...	XX	XXX	XXX	21
30	...	XXI	XXXI	XXXI	22
31	...	XVIII	XXXII	XXXII	23
32	...	XIX	XXXIII	XXXIII	24
33	...	XXXIV	XXXIV	XXXIV	33
34	...	XXXV	XXXV	XXXV	34
35	...	XXXVI	XXXVI	XXXVI	35
36	...	XXXVII	XXXVII	XXXVII	36
37	...	XXXVIII	XXXVIII	XXXVIII	37
38	...	XXXIX	XXXIX	XXXIX	38
39	...	XL	XL	XL	39

The Spiritual Canticle

Until recently it was always assumed that the Seville edition represented the full work as first written by St. John, and that the previous editions represented a version much cut down and specially prepared to guard against possible abuses of the Saint's exalted doctrine by the Illuminists who were active at the time. This impression has now been shown by the learned editor of the critical edition of St. John's works to be completely erroneous. (E.C., II, p. 141). A was not a reduced version of B, but was written by the Saint himself as it stands. None of the original MSS. of the four principal treatises is forthcoming, but the Carmelite Nuns of San Lúcar de Barrameda have in safe keeping a MS. of A which bears the visa of the Saint and has been annotated in his own hand. It has, therefore, almost the value of an original. This MS. has fortunately been printed *in extenso* by Fray Gerardo (E.C., II, pp. 493-613). On the cover St. John has written and signed the following declaration: "*Este libro es el borrador de q ya se sacó en limpio,*" which may be freely rendered: This book represents the original draft from which copies have since been made. The additions in the Saint's handwriting consist of (a) words inserted in the text, (b) marginal annotations. All these have been shown by Fray Gerardo, the insertions by the use of italics, the marginal annotations in the form of footnotes to his text. I count twenty-three of the former and twenty-seven of the latter. The title-page and four specimen pages of the MS. have been reproduced in facsimile.

The importance of this publication can hardly be over-rated. For the first time we are put in possession of a work by the great mystic, authenticated by himself and, as far as it goes, placed on a basis unassailable by criticism. From this little MS. we are able to affirm with absolute certainty the order in which he placed the stanzas of his Canticle in 1584. A knowledge of the correct order is imperatively necessary for the understanding of the key which he has left to the states of the soul as developed in the Canticle. In the commentary to A 27 he writes:

The Spiritual Canticle

"For the better understanding of the arrangement of these stanzas and of the way the soul advances till it comes to the very highest state, the state of Spiritual Marriage which it has now reached, and of which by the help of God I am about to speak, we must take note that the soul has first of all to be tried in the travail and bitterness of mortification, and also in meditation. This state is described from the first stanza to that beginning *A thousand graces diffusing* [A 5 ; B V]. Then the soul passes through the straits and pains of love of which she continues to speak till the stanza, *Turn them away, Beloved* [A 12 ; B XIII]. And further, after recounting that she received great communications and many visits from her Beloved by means of which she advances in entire and perfect love, so much so that renouncing all things herself, she surrenders herself to a union of love in spiritual betrothal, in which, as one already betrothed, she receives from her Spouse noble gifts of jewels, as she has sung from the stanza onward where the spiritual betrothal occurred [A 12 ; B XIII] to this present one which commences *The bride has entered* [A 27 ; B XXII], in which the Bridegroom makes mention of the spiritual marriage between the soul and the Son of God."* From this it results that Stanzas 1 to 5 deal with the initial stages of the spiritual life (discursive prayer, mortification, tribulations), Stanzas 6 to 11 (XII) with the "straits and pains of love" indicative, no doubt, of an advance in the contemplative life, Stanzas 12 (XIII) to 26 (XXI) with the spiritual betrothal, and from Stanza 27 (XXII) to the end with the union by transformation, known as the spiritual marriage.

An examination of the Table given above reveals the astounding fact that four of the stanzas which in A are found in that part of the Canticle which treats of the spiritual marriage (Stanzas 29, 30, 31, 32), are in B transferred to that part of the Canticle which treats of the spiritual betrothal (Stanzas XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI), and that no less than ten stanzas of the spiritual betrothal in A

* See E.C., II, p. 277. for B, and p. 577 for A. Also Lewis, Stanza XXII, par. 2, for a translation of B. The differences between A and B are not of substantial import.

The Spiritual Canticle

(Stanzas 15 to 24) are in B supposed to expound the spiritual marriage (Stanzas XXIV to XXXIII). This should of itself be quite sufficient to convince us that the arrangement of B cannot be the work of the author. It is impossible to conceive that he should, later on, consider that verses intended to represent a particular state of the soul, the spiritual betrothal, were as suitable, or more suitable, to describe another and more advanced state, the spiritual marriage. If St. John is really the author of the considerable additions to A shown in B (upon a rough estimate 20,000 words), it would nevertheless seem impossible to hold him responsible for the order in which the stanzas have come down to us in the Jaen and other MSS. The arrangement of the order in B shows a number of oversights indicating a want of familiarity with the commentary that would be impossible in the real author. To take a few instances :

1. The commentary of B XXIV (A 15) opens: "In the two foregoing stanzas the bride-soul has sung of the graces and magnitude of her Beloved, the Son of God."* Not so. This sentence obviously applies to A 13 and 14 which, unlike B XXII and XXIII—the two foregoing—are grouped together for comment, and of which it is expressly stated that in them the soul "does nothing else but recount and praise the magnificence of her Beloved."† The editor of the Seville edition, noticing the inconsistency of the opening of B XXIV, alters the Jaen MS., which is the basis of his text, as follows: "In the two foregoing stanzas, that is to say XIV and XV" (A 13 and 14), and Lewis, observing that the editor has made nonsense, translates: "In two of the foregoing stanzas—the fourteenth and fifteenth . . ." The evasion is neat. Lewis was a great literary artist, and has given us a translation of St. John in which the sublimity and clarity of the original are marvellously reproduced: he is concerned alone with the deep mystical meaning of his subject, and no one will feel disposed to blame him that he does not

* E.C., II, p. 285.

† E.C., II, p. 233. Lewis, XIV and XV, par. 1.

The Spiritual Canticle

attempt to fathom some of the singular inconsistencies of this compilation.

2. The commentary on B XVIII (A 31) opens as follows: "It is the Bride that speaks in this stanza, who seeing herself as to the higher part of the soul endowed with rich and exquisite gifts and delights by her Beloved, and desirous of keeping herself in the security and continued possession of them in which she had been placed by the Bridegroom in the two preceding stanzas," etc. (E.C., II, p. 260). But in the two preceding stanzas, XVI and XVII, it is the bride who is speaking and acting, not the Bridegroom; whereas in A, where XVIII is 31, Stanzas 29 and 30 are grouped for comment, and are spoken by the Bridegroom, who is providing for a soul no longer betrothed but espoused. Lewis, with his fine instinct, seeing that any reference to "two preceding stanzas" is altogether out of place in the commentary on XVIII, quietly cuts out such reference.

3. On the grouped Stanzas XX and XXI (A 29 and 30), which in B are made to occur in the part relating to spiritual betrothal, the Saint writes: "He (the Bridegroom) brings, so far as it is possible in this life, the three powers of memory, understanding and will to the perfection of their objects, etc." (E.C., II, p. 268; Lewis, § 1). This is clearly enough union by transformation, in other words the spiritual marriage, and that there can be no doubt on this point is shown a little further on by the open reference to "spiritual persons who have not yet attained *this* state of spiritual marriage." Lewis (§ 9) translates "*the* state of spiritual marriage," and so in part smoothes away the difficulty. If I refer to him at all it is to prove more positively the existence of these singular inconsistencies.

4. Stanza B XXII (A 27). In this the spiritual marriage is consummated. The commentary refers to the foxes having been chased and the North wind having ceased "as happened in the two preceding stanzas." But there is no mention of such things in XX and XXI which are the "preceding stanzas," but in XVI and

The Spiritual Canticle

XVII, which in A are 25 and 26, and consequently do precede 27.

5. Stanza B XXVII (A 18). The spiritual marriage was celebrated in XXII, and yet here, six stanzas further on, the comment explains that "In this stanza the soul recounts how the two contracting parties gave themselves to each other in this spiritual betrothal (*espiritual desposorio*)" (E.C., II, 305). On page 307 there is a clear reference to "*este estado de desposorio espiritual*," and if this were not sufficient to show the subject which is being treated, the last line of the stanza itself, here needing no explanation, runs, "'Twas here that I promised to be his bride." All these references are perfectly correct in A 18, for we are still nine stanzas from the spiritual marriage. Lewis translates correctly enough "spiritual betrothal," though he leaves out the defining and limiting words "*this state of spiritual betrothal*," but the other three translations to which I have access at the moment render *desposorio espiritual* by "spiritual marriage"!*

6. At the end of the commentary on Stanza XXVIII, which in B is supposed to be dealing with the spiritual marriage, there is actually a definition of spiritual betrothal! Of the last line of the stanza St. John writes: "The meaning of the words for my purpose is that the soul in this state of the spiritual betrothal is for the most part living in union with the love of God." Lewis (§9) translates correctly "spiritual betrothal," but the Paris Carmelites (IV, 314), Canon Hoornaert (IV, 178) and Marco di S.F. (p. 350) all three again render *espiritual desposorio* by "spiritual marriage," thus completely obscuring the holy writer's meaning. There can be no doubt whatsoever as to the sense in which the Saint uses *desposorio*, as is shown by the following passage in which he

* (a) *Vie et Œuvres de St. Jean de la Croix*. Traduction par les Carmélites de Paris. Sixth edition. Tours, 1922. Four vols. (Vol. IV, pp. 301 and 304.)

(b) *Œuvres Spirituelles de Saint Jean de la Croix*. Traduction sur l'E.C. par Le Chanoine Hector Hoornaert. Second edition. Paris and Brussels, 1922-23. Four vols. (Vol. IV, pp. 171 and 173.)

(c) *Opere di San Giovanni de la Croce*. Nuova Traduzione dal Castigliano da Fra Marco di San Francesco. Venice, 1748, fol. (pp. 346 and 348).

The Spiritual Canticle

contrasts betrothal and marriage: "El matrimonio espiritual . . . es mucho más sin comparación que el desposorio espiritual" (E.C., II, p. 278).

I have given sufficient instances to show that the text of B bristles with inconsistencies. No one will believe that St. John is responsible for them, even on the (to me) impossible theory that he is responsible for the changed order of the stanzas. How comes it, then, that the stanzas in B appear in an order different from A, and that the text of the commentary has again and again not been brought into harmony with the new order? For the present there exists not a shred of evidence to show. One can only suppose that some ambitious person after St. John's death took upon him to recast the final version, and did it very clumsily. On account of its importance I notice particularly one case in which an attempt has been made to bring the commentary into harmony with the new order. The commentary on B XXII opens: "The bride having used all diligence in order that the foxes might be caught, the north wind cease, *and the nymphs be silenced*, etc." These last words do not occur in the commentary of A 31. The stanza in B which refers to the nymphs is XVIII. It has been wrested from its place in the spiritual marriage (A 31) and inserted in XXII in an effort to give consistency to the change. But it is impossible to believe that this insertion is the handiwork of the Saint after reading a remarkable passage at the end of the commentary on A 31—which has not been allowed to appear in B!—in which he explains his reference to the nymphs of Judea when treating of the spiritual marriage.

I consider that St. John of the Cross was possessed of unrivalled expository powers, acquired by a strong and clear intellect in the course of a finished scholastic education. His vivid imagination and keen sense of fitness should prove a guarantee against any lapses in method or treatment. But I have to admit that A 17, for no reason that is apparent, does seem to deal exclusively with the spiritual marriage ten stanzas before the consummation of this is reached. The stanza opens:

The Spiritual Canticle

In the inner cellar

Of my Beloved have I drunk, etc.

and the Saint begins to comment: "Here the soul speaks of that sovereign grace which God gave in drawing it into His innermost love which is the union or *transformation of love in God*. . . . In order to give some idea of the meaning of this cellar and to declare what the soul is trying to make comprehensible, I have need that the Holy Ghost should hold my hand and guide my pen. The cellar is *the highest degree of love to which the soul may attain in this life* . . . because there is wrought the perfect union with God, *the spiritual marriage*, of which the soul is now speaking. . . . It is God Himself who communicates Himself to the soul *now in the marvellous bliss of its transformation*. . . . Though the soul remains always in *this high estate of marriage* after God has placed it there, etc."

There can be no question that the Saint, throughout the commentary on this stanza, is referring to the state known as the spiritual marriage, in spite of his own express statement that he is dealing with the betrothal only down to A 26 inclusive. This statement is confirmed in the most positive manner by a marginal note in the *Borrador* (E.C., p. 577). One line of the note is hidden by the binding, but it continues, "Desposorio espiritual, de cuyas propiedades ha ido cantando *hasta aquí*." Nothing could be more emphatically precise. The astounding thing is that in the next stanza of the Canticle, A 18 (B XXVII), which continues the subject of the inner cellar and describes what took place there, he leaves the subject of marriage and reverts to the betrothal. "There," runs the last line, "there I promised to be his bride!" and the commentary itself says: "In this stanza the soul recounts how the two contracting parties gave themselves to each other in this *spiritual betrothal*." It must be admitted that the references in A 17 to spiritual marriage do give some colour to the change in the order of this stanza effected in B. In its position in A the climax is premature, the dramatic moment has been

The Spiritual Cantic

anticipated: this is not the perfect treatment we should expect from so consummate a master. The point is puzzling, but where so great a mystic is concerned it may have an appositeness that escapes the vulgar eye. Be that as it may, we are confronted by the fact under the sign manual of the Saint, that this was the place in the commentary assigned by him to it six years after the poem was written.*

The *Bulletin Hispanique* for October-December, 1922 (Vol. XXIV, pp. 307-342) contains a remarkable article by Dom Philippe Chevallier, Benedictine monk of Solesme, with the suggestive title "Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix a-t-il été interpolé?" The article marks a new departure in the treatment of the text of the works of St. John of the Cross. Its scholarship is irreproachable, and the writer's lucid and thorough handling of an intricate subject inspires confidence and arouses keen interest.† It would have been a real satisfaction to lay Dom Chevallier's arguments in detail before the readers of this Review: for the present I fear I can only state his conclusions, which are that all the additions to A found in B are the work of an alien hand, and that this version was put together at earliest in 1626, thirty-five years after the death of the Saint. His arguments are sufficiently strong. Why, if B is the final definitive work of St. John himself, should A ever have been published? The only possible answer is that the several MSS. of B remained hidden in Carmelite Nunneries. But Dom Chevallier makes the strong point that the Cantic and its commentary were written for Anne of Jesus. That great daughter of St. Teresa left Spain for France in 1604, and France for the Low Countries in 1607. She died at Brussels in 1621. The first version in Spanish published there in 1627 appears to have been taken from a MS. which she had brought with her from Spain

* A 15 (B XXIV), though in a lesser degree, also seems at times to deal with a higher state than the spiritual betrothal.

† It is entirely owing to this article that I learnt that the French translation of 1622 only contained the original thirty-nine stanzas of the Cantic, and that the Spanish MS. from which the Italian version of 1627 was translated must be regarded as a distinct version of the work.

The Spiritual Canticle

(Chevallier, pp. 312-313). As the whole work was written for her and dedicated to her, it is certain that she must have received from St. John a copy of the revised and definitive version B: indeed, according to a tradition now proved to be baseless, the Jaen MS. was said to have been such a copy. There is absolutely no ostensible reason why B should not have been published. If there is doctrine in the commentary liable to be wrested to a bad use by false mystics, this applies as much to A as to B. Dom Chevallier, summing up (p. 337), describes B as an "ensemble de mauvaises lectures, de fausses références, d'inconsequences, d'inadvertances, de maladroites et de contradictions," and the few instances I have given serve to show that this deliberate judgment is hardly too severe so far as the mere structural compilation of the work is concerned.

But there is one argument against the thesis that the additions in B are interpolations which is of considerable force. As I have pointed out, the *Borrador* of Barrameda, or authenticated MS. of A, bears numerous insertions and marginal notes in the handwriting of the Saint. These are not to be found in Paris 1622, Brussels 1627, or Madrid 1630 (which is A plus Stanza XI), but they have nearly all been incorporated or developed in B. Of twenty-three insertions sixteen have been used, and of twenty-seven marginal notes eighteen have been used. I give two or three instances to show how this has been done:

Marginal Note in A

Lo cual es entrarla más en su amor. (E.C., II, 566.)

Y así pienso que este estado nunca es sin la confirmación en gracia; porque se confirma la fe de ambas partes, confirmándose aquí la de (ella en ?) Dios. (E.C., II, 577.)

Text in B, showing treatment

... que le hace llaga de amor por la gran ternura del afecto con que está aficionado á ella, lo cual es entrarla más en su amor. (E.C., II, 328.)

This passage of highly important doctrine has been assumed into B with trifling verbal differences. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as an interpolation of alien matter. (E.C., II, 278.)

The Spiritual Cantic

Porque mediante la fortaleza que ya aquí el alma tiene, se hace esta unión que no se puede recibir tan (?) estrecho abrazo sino el alma fuerte. (E.C., II, 579.)

El cuello significa *aquí* la fortaleza del alma, mediante la cual, como habemos dicho, *se hace esta junta y unión* entre ella y el esposo, *porque no podría el alma sufrir tan estrecho abrazo si no estuviese muy fuerte.* (E.C., II, 280.)

If we are to accept Dom Chevallier's theory that all the additions to B are simply interpolations by another hand, we should have to believe that the interpolator knew the *Borrador* and used it. That he knew it is not unlikely in itself, but that he should use its more trifling notes and insertions is against all probability. It is really impossible to see anything but the direct action of the Saint himself in this process, and it goes far to warrant us in accepting the whole of B as his handiwork.

But above and beyond all proofs, if I may be allowed for a moment to lapse into subjective argument, surely all the additions to B are obviously Juanine, of the very fibre and essence of the mystic soul of St. John at its noblest and best? His Spanish disciples must be good judges of this, and Fray Gerardo writes: "Consider the style of these pieces, meditate upon the profound conceptions they contain, and you will clearly see that the whole bear the characteristic personal impress of St. John of the Cross himself" (E.C., II, 144). For the present there is no evidence to show how so much of the final version comes to be out of its proper order, or why Anne of Jesus should have been without a copy of a work specially dedicated to her, or why A should have been printed if B was already in existence. One can only hope that research will clear up these points, and it is encouraging that such practised scholars as Dom Chevallier and M. Jean Baruzi* are devoting themselves to a minute

* M. Baruzi has an article in the *Bulletin Hispanique* (Vol. XXIV, pp. 18-23), the interest and importance of which to students of the works of St. John of the Cross is indicated by its title: "Le problème des citations scripturaires en langue latine dans l'œuvre de saint Jean de la Croix." He is engaged upon a study of the authenticity of version B which cannot fail to be illuminative.

The Spiritual Canticle

scrutiny of the works of St. John. But it is to the pious, illustrious and learned Order of the Discalced Carmelites that we must look for the most effective help in the solution of these vital points. For definitive solution can only come from MSS., and MSS., at present unknown, can only be looked for in the houses of the Discalced Friars and Nuns. December 27th, 1926, is the second centenary of the canonization of St. John. It would be like the infallibly right instinct of the Church, in the midst of the prevailing materialism, to raise St. John to the dignity of a Doctor of the Universal Church, her mystical Doctor *par excellence*, and it would be like one of her happy touches to choose this date for the ceremony. All doubts about the authenticity of his works, all troublesome questions of texts, should be solved against the auspicious day. Here, then, is motive sufficient for the Order, imitating the spirit and methods of their great Eighteenth Century scholar, Fray Andrés de la Encarnación, so to labour that the works of this incomparable guide to the spiritual life may be accepted without cavil before the great day, when, once more acknowledged by authority to be *divinitus instructus*, he shall be proclaimed to the applauding city and world SACRAE MYSTICAE THEOLOGIAE PRINCEPS ET DOCTOR!

MONTGOMERY CARMICHAEL.

June 10th, 1923.

POSTSCRIPTUM.—The following show the additions to B, so set forth as to enable the reader to bracket them in his copy of Lewis's translation of the Spiritual Canticle. He will thus also obtain a general idea of the extent of A, though there are some passages in A which are not to be found in B. And he will also be able to gauge for himself the value of the pages and passages we should lose if it can be shown upon scientific evidence that they are not by St. John. "Lose" is perhaps not the right expression, for whoever the author, they cannot but prove to be a distinct spiritual gain. That the author is St. John I

The Spiritual Canticle

cannot doubt. Who but he could have written the wonderful "Note" preceding Stanza XXVII, in which God is compared to a slave and the soul is compared to God, or the "Note" preceding Stanza XXIX, with the famous appraisement of the "instant of pure love." And who, indeed, but he could have written the "interpolated" paragraphs 7 to 17 of Stanza XXXVIII, in which we proceed from splendour to splendour until we reach the topmost peaks of Juanine sublimity. If all this is not by John de Yepes, then assuredly he let fall his white mantle on some *alter ego* as he soared into the Empyrean from his narrow bed of death in the Convent of Ubeda. This, I think, will grow upon the reader if he will have the patience to mark the suspect passages as I suggest.

Bracket the following: The whole of the "Argument." STANZA I: "Note" preceding this; § 6; §§ 8 to 17; in § 18 from "Thus he speaks . . ." to ". . . and the feelings"; from "Yea if a man . . ." in § 19 to ". . . belongs to hope" in § 20. STANZA III: §§ 2 to 4. STANZA IX: "Note" preceding this. STANZA X: "Note" preceding; in § 5 from ". . . and Tobias . . ." to end of paragraph. STANZA XI: The "Note" preceding this, the Stanza itself, and the whole of the commentary come out. STANZA XII: "Note" preceding; §§ 10 to 12. STANZA XIII: "Note" preceding. STANZAS XIV and XV: last sentence of "Note" preceding these; §§ 9 and 10 of Stanza XV. STANZA XVI: "Note" preceding; § 1; from "The great variety . . ." in § 2 to the end of § 7. STANZA XVII: "Note" preceding; in § 2 from "But the communications . . ." to end of paragraph. STANZA XVIII: "Note" preceding. STANZA XIX: "Note" preceding. STANZAS XX and XXI: "Note" preceding; §§ 14 to 16; § 21 from "That is to say . . ." to end of paragraph. STANZA XXII: "Note" preceding. STANZA XXIII: §§ 5 and 6. STANZA XXIV: "Note" preceding; § 11, and § 12 to ". . . keep in mind that . . ."; § 14. STANZA XXV: "Note" preceding. STANZA XXVI: "Note" preceding; §§ 11 to 13; in § 14 from "The soul is now . . ." to end of paragraph; in § 15 from ". . . for those habits," to the end of § 16. STANZA XXVII: "Note" preceding; § 6. STANZA XXVIII: "Note" preceding. STANZA XXIX: "Note" preceding; in § 6 from "The soul remembers . . ." to ". . . love of Him." STANZA XXX: "Note" preceding; §§ 13 and 14. STANZA XXXI: "Note" preceding; §§ 5

The Spiritual Canticle

and 6; in § 9 from “. . . and therefore the soul” to end of paragraph. STANZA XXXII: “Note” preceding; § 9. STANZA XXXIII: “Note” preceding; § 2; §§ 5 and 6; in § 7 from “This is as much . . .” to the end of § 9. STANZA XXXIV: “Note” preceding; § 2 from “for this is . . .” to end of paragraph. STANZA XXXV: “Note” preceding. STANZA XXXVI: “Note” preceding; in § 4 from “For the Church . . .” to end of paragraph; in § 8 from “It was to this . . .” to end of paragraph; § 14. STANZA XXXVII: “Note” preceding; in § 6 from “To say ‘we will enter’ . . .” to end of paragraph; in § 7 from “It was in the . . .” to end of paragraph. STANZA XXXVIII: “Note” preceding; §§ 7 to 17. STANZA XXXIX: “Note” preceding; § 1; in § 13 from “This is the canticle . . .” to end of paragraph; in § 16 from “. . . and for this reason . . .” to end of § 21. STANZA XL: § 1; in § 5 from “Under these circumstances . . .” to the end of the paragraph; § 8, from the beginning of the paragraph down to the words “. . . of the Church triumphant.”

CARDINAL POLE AND HIS FRIENDS AT PADUA

WITHIN the first decades of the Sixteenth Century the University of Padua had secured a primacy in Europe which was to last for close upon three hundred years. Fostered by the prudent care of the Carraresi, the one institution of their Signory which Venice maintained and developed after their fall, the Studio enjoyed for the wise ends of her policy every aid which Venetian power and wealth could devise. The trade routes from north and west, traversing the Venetian plain eastwards to the Adriatic, provided students with security in travel and facilities for the exchange of money and the transmission of correspondence; the period of the wandering "Goliards" had long since ended, and the academic pilgrimage, which in the first centuries of the University movement had been an affair of individual courage and enterprise, as of isolated barbarians migrating from the impenetrable fastness of northern ignorance in search of Italian learning and sunshine, had become a daily, crowded transaction, in which the newcomers, no longer strangers and pilgrims, but fellow-citizens indeed, met the Cisalpine students on equal terms. As jurists or artists they were incorporated according to their place of origin into one or other of the Ultramontane "nations," each of which possessed its statutory rights and customs and shared in the administration of university business and in the privileges which the City-Commune was always eager to bestow. At a later day fashion, family tradition, the tolerance of the Republic in matters of doctrinal controversy, the proximity of Padua to Venice with its splendour of entertainment and masquerades, or the hope of finding some forgotten codex or other precious fragment of classical antiquity in Cardinal Bessarion's library, kept up a steady flow of visitors from abroad, for whom the fame of the professors and of the medical schools had been too poor a motive; but at the beginning of the Sixteenth Century

Cardinal Pole

the learned world was still one, in spite of the passing enmities of rival states and the natural barriers of race and speech, and in its unspecialized control lay all the chief functions of statecraft, both ecclesiastical and secular, no less than the advancement of abstract knowledge or the guardianship of manners and good taste. Moreover, for Englishmen of that period there was a special reason why they should fix their choice upon Padua as the goal of their university travels. English foreign policy was directed towards a league with Venice, and from the reign of Henry VII onwards a succession of English academical persons, graduates of Oxford and doctors of Padua, continued long to work in this behalf, whether as accredited representatives of England to the Signory or as informal agents who kept the Government at home informed of foreign affairs.

When Reginald Pole, however, came as a student to Padua, the Italian universities were still primarily regarded, in Erasmus' phrase, as *emporia* of sound learning rather than as schools of policy, although this second motive was not altogether wanting. The study of Greek and the mastery of Ciceronian phrase were possible, no doubt, in England, since Linacre and William Latimer had returned thus enriched from Padua, but opportunity was rare and the labour disproportionately great. The story which these two Paduan laureates could tell their former pupil of the eventful journey made with Grocyn to Italy—of the meeting with Politian in Florence, the memorable morning in the Vatican Library when Ermolao Barbaro found Linacre poring upon a manuscript of Plato and turned his thoughts to Galen and medicine and Padua, of their Greek studies with the sons of Lorenzo de' Medici under Demetrius Chalcondyles, or of the days spent in Aldus' printing-house at Venice over Aristotle—all this would stir the youth who in his sixteenth year had graduated at Magdalen and was already noticed for his grave, studious ways, to a desire of studying at Padua, "nursery of the Arts." Richard Pace also, his royal kinsman's ambassador to Venice and an intimate

Cardinal Pole and

friend of Latimer's, twenty years previously had been the pupil of Leonico at Padua, where Tunstall, at that time a student in the Faculty of Law, had welcomed him and introduced him to Mark Musurus.

The first recorded notice of Pole's intention to go to Padua is an entry in the King's *Book of Payments* under date of February, 1521: "To Mr. Pole, whom the King sends to Italy, finding for one year, £100." Pole was then in his nineteenth year. He must have set out shortly afterwards, for on April 27th he writes to Henry VIII from Padua, announcing his safe arrival, and expressing deep gratitude for the King's liberality in enabling him to come. The journey, he says, has been costly, and the Paduan magistrates, notwithstanding his assurance that he had come simply to study, refused to allow him to live in retirement, but, out of respect to the King's wishes, treated him with the greatest deference and honour. He is resolved, he adds, not to allow the nobles and bishops who are at Padua to outdo him in diligence, and he hopes that the King will not permit him for want of money to abandon Padua for some obscure place in Italy.

The reference to Henry's wishes in this letter from Pole finds confirmation in a letter to Venice from Surian, the Venetian ambassador in London, in which he notes, on April 1st, that Henry recommends to the Signory his nephew "*Domino Renaldo*, who is coming to study at Padua"; yet within a month the King's mind towards his relative had changed owing to the implication of Pole's two elder brothers in the Duke of Buckingham's plot, and we find Surian writing again to give Henry's warning to Venice that "the State must not make too much of *Domino Renaldo* lest he should begin to lift himself up like the rest."

Meanwhile the young Englishman, whose ecclesiastical preferments were numerous and wealthy, was busy setting up his household and making many friendships which influenced profoundly all his later life. A patent of May 21st, authorizing him to export plate and stuffs from England, points to a considerable establishment. A

His Friends at Padua

little later he obtained a licence for himself and four of his servants to carry weapons—a custom of long standing at Padua, where, as late as 1587, a young Milanese ecclesiastic went about with an escort of soldiers, and where Sanudo, in Pole's day, records no fewer than twenty noble students, each of whom maintained from twenty to forty servants. With Pole, however, whose earliest memories brooded round the quiet scenes of his country home in Staffordshire, the years spent in boyhood at Sheen, or the cool gardens of Magdalen, and whose later life, wherever cast, found solace in a "study and a garden," as he wrote in 1546 to Vittoria Colonna, such preparations were no more than a tribute to Henry's first wishes and a means to the decorous fulfilment of his promise to study. His portrait at this time is given us in the correspondence of his first friends in Padua, Pietro Bembo and Christophe Longueil—Longolius, as the Latin usage of the time named him. An infinite weariness and satiety of Rome, where for years he had been compelled, as Papal Secretary, to compose letters which irked his taste for Cicero and filled him with disgust, and a longing to revisit the *dolce patria* of Ferrara, bright with memories of happy days, brought Bembo back to Venice in June, 1521. Leave of absence from Rome had been granted to his plea of ill-health, but in reality, as he wrote to the Bishop of Salerno, he had left it intending never to return. The months of convalescence were divided between his house in Padua—"city of most temperate air, in itself most lovely, and above all convenient, restful, and apt for the pursuit of letters and study as any that I ever saw; nay, far more so"—where he would read or write in his magnificent garden with its chestnut trees and summer pavilion, or at his country villa of Santa Maria del Non, between Padua and Cittadella. It was the first week of July, and the Papal Secretary had hardly banished from his ears the din of Rome, when he received a Latin letter, "replete with doctrine and elegance," from Pole, begging the gift of his acquaintance. The request and the manner of it pleased Bembo greatly. His letter of reply, dated from

Cardinal Pole and

Non, July 11th, is a spontaneous expression of glad acceptance. Longolius, who had ridden out from Padua with Pole's letter, carried back Bembo's answer.

Few persons in a century overcharged with dazzling reputations have suffered so complete an eclipse of their fame as this young scholar; yet few have had a more adventurous story or have left more copious materials in epistolaries of the time for a curious biography. Born at Mechlin in 1490, the son of Antoine de Longueil, Bishop of Léon and Chancellor of Anne of Brittany, at the age of nine he had been sent to Paris to study. Quick, industrious, gifted with an excellent memory, and resolute to succeed, when only sixteen he accompanied Philip of Austria to Spain in quest of the Crown of Castille, and had charge of the secret ciphers. A little later we find him in Germany at the Court of Prince Charles, the future Emperor Charles the Fifth. After years of travel and escapades in Switzerland and Italy, especially in Rome, where he first made the acquaintance of Bembo, Longolius came to Venice and lived in Bembo's house, until the departure of the latter to Rome in 1520 left him without a lodging. He had moved accordingly to Padua and found a new protector in Stefano Sauli, brother of Cardinal Bandinello. It was at Sauli's house in the spring of 1521 that Pole first met Longolius. Linacre and Pace would seem to have spoken of him to Pole before the latter left England, and to have given Pole commendatory letters; for a letter from Longolius to Linacre, written on May 7th, 1521, has been preserved, in which he thanks him for a present received that day as a token of friendship at the hands of Reginald Pole.

Two months later, as we have seen, Longolius was the bearer of the note from Pole to Bembo which resulted in their friendship. Bembo's reply—hurriedly written, since Longolius was shouting for his horse and threatening to start if he did not make haste—at once brought the English student out to Non, a retreat from the noise and dust of Padua as grateful to the young student as the Benedictine grange of Santa Giustina in the Euganean

His Friends at Padua

hills would prove some fifteen years later, when, on the eve of his journey to Rome and the Cardinalate, he sat out on the *loggia* which looks towards Padua, "discussing with 'Marco Monaco' the letters which he had received from Tunstall and Cromwell and the orders given him in the name of their master, Henry VIII." "Farewell," he wrote then, "from our Paradise; for such in truth may I call this place where I now reside, both on account of the pleasant country and most delightful hills, and yet more by reason of the companions whose society I enjoy here. . . . I fancy myself with my Maker in Paradise." And Bembo, describing the rest and refreshment of Non to a Roman friend, declares, with equal joy in the "purest of human pleasures," that there "I hear no tiresome and distasteful news. I do not think of law-suits. I do not talk with Procurators. I do not visit Auditories of the Rota. I hear no sounds but those of nightingales singing round about me in melodious rivalry with other birds to give me pleasure. I read, I write, when I will; I ride and I walk, and not seldom I take an airing in a little wood at the end of my garden. From this garden, most delicious and most lovely, I often gather with my own hands a salad for the first course at supper, or a great basketful of strawberries in the morning, which by and by perfume my mouth and the whole table. I forget to tell you that the garden, the house, everywhere, is filled with roses all the day. Then I want nothing more but to go a fair stretch in my little boat, at first down a wandering streamlet which ripples past the house, and then along the Brenta, into which after a short course my streamlet flows—joyous and noble river; and this at evening when running water rather than the land delights me." Bembo, the courtly humanist, now in his middle years—Longolius, still pursuing with febrile eagerness the ambition of his fading youth and doomed soon to die—Reginald Pole, already touched by the dark shadows of the long years to come, grave, monastic, and a little withdrawn by his wistful melancholy from the two friends with whom he converses in that pleasant garden—they fix forever in the

Cardinal Pole and

mind one crowning moment of the late Renaissance, the rich glow of its golden afternoon of harmonious accomplishment, but with it the chilling sense of sunset fast approaching and an impending storm.

A few months after Pole's arrival in Padua, Longolius went to lodge in his house. The brother of Sauli had fallen sick and summoned Stefano to his bedside; Stefano left Padua for Genoa, taking Flaminio with him, and their home of gay companionship thus came to an end. For a time there seems to have been some friendly rivalry among the patrician students of Padua as to which of them should entertain Longolius, but eventually he accepted the hospitality of his English friend. "At first," Longolius wrote to Sauli, "I thought to move no further than to some neighbouring house, but now beyond a doubt I find myself transplanted to distant England. The stately comfort of our former life together and its quiet leisure are indeed assured to me, nor can I complain of any want of kindness on the part of those with whom I now am living; but I miss your sweet company and all our happy conversations. For Reginald Pole, though of excellent parts and learned, and a youth of fine discernment, cares little for our kind of discussions, and, while he is endowed with a marvellous modesty, he is also prodigiously taciturn." That this view of Pole's retiring disposition was shared by other friends at Padua is borne out by a letter from Bembo to Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo towards the end of Pole's residence there as a student. Bembo writes to reassure the Cardinal about the way in which his young brother is spending his time at the University. After praising the regularity of Giovambattista's attendance at Greek lectures, and the virtuous and learned company which filled his house, he goes on: "Lately, while I was at my country villa, he came to visit me with *Monsignor d'Inghilterra*, who, apart from the nobility of his birth, being the King's nearest relative, is perhaps the most virtuous, erudite, and grave young man in Italy at this present time. Messer Leonico came with them, a reverend man of seventy

His Friends at Padua

years and a philosopher, and deeply versed in both the Greek and the Latin tongues."

It would, however, be misleading to suppose that literary pursuits and religious exercises were the sole occupations at this time of Pole at Padua. From time to time there are entries in the *Diaries* of Sanudo which show him taking an honoured place in the state ceremonies of St. Mark's and assisting at various Venetian pageantries. It is the Vigil of St. Mark, for example, and *Domino Raynaldo Polo*, wearing a long gown of black damask, walks with Pace and the Papal and Imperial Ambassadors in the Doge's procession; or there is a gorgeous "triumph" in honour of the Holy League, with costumed figures representing the patrons of the Kings of England and of France, of the Doge and the Duke of Milan, and *Monsignor d'Inghilterra* comes from Padua to the house of the English Ambassador in order to see the show in the Piazza; or, again, it is Carnival time and a number of Venetian gentlemen are to celebrate the victory at Pavia by a comedy with interludes of verse and music, and we see "the cousin of the King of England who studies at Padua" present with other guests, including the Papal Legate in disguise, to hear a rehearsal of the piece in Ca' Dandolo, at that time rented by the Paduans. Such visits to Venice were, doubtless, frequent throughout the whole period of Pole's stay at Padua, but, during his second summer there, the arrival of Pace in Venice from Rome, in order to negotiate, as Henry's Ambassador, an arrangement between the Republic and the Emperor, caused him to pay a more memorable visit. The Council of Ten, supposing that Pace would travel by way of Padua, sent instructions to their Paduan "Capitano" to defray all the Ambassador's travelling expenses in Venetian territory, and, if he lodged with Pole, to provide victualling for him and his retinue, and a supply of corn for the horses; and they gave orders that "Dom. Leonico who lectures to that English Monsignor and had formerly been tutor to Pace himself" should be acquainted of the Ambassador's coming, in order that

Cardinal Pole and

he might testify, as of himself, to the goodwill of the Signory towards him. This was on August 9th. Pace, however, who had set out from Rome the same day, came down the Po from Ferrara without visiting Padua, and entered Venice in state on August 20th. Pole, meanwhile, had gone to Venice, leaving Longolius almost alone in his Paduan house. Longolius was himself anxious to see Pace, who had received him with great kindness in England, but when Pole urged the interruption to his studies which the journey would cause unnecessarily—since Pace would certainly return with him to Padua for a time—and feeling, besides, somewhat unwell in the sultry August days, he at last decided not to intrude upon the first meeting of the two friends, and remained behind. So much we may gather from the letter which he wrote to Pole from Padua on August 22nd. Three days later, a second letter was hurriedly put into Pole's hands at Venice. "I am worn out with pain," Longolius cries, "and I can only breathe with difficulty. The day after my last letter to you a violent fever seized me, and I have suffered more these three days than ever before in my life. It was surely a divinely sent premonition which led me to show you my collection of books just before you started, and to ask you to accept them as a gift, if anything untoward should happen to me whilst you were away. In the name of our friendship, which I feel to be at its close—our last day together was nearer than either of us expected—I beg you to remember me, if I die, with all the kindly offices of piety that our love and friendship may claim. Take care of your health, and greet Pace warmly for me." Pole at once hastened back to Padua, in order to nurse his friend; but the end did not come so soon as either of them supposed. Longolius lingered on until September 11th, when he died in the presence of Pole and Bembo. His body was buried in the church of San Francesco. Bembo wrote this epitaph for him:

*Te iuvenem rapuere Deae fatalia nentes,
Stamina, quum scirent moriturum tempore nullo,
Longoli, tibi si canos seniumque dedissent.*

His Friends at Padua

And Pole, mindful of his dying request, made a collection of all the extant letters of Longolius, printing them with the anonymous prefatory *Life* which is our chief authority for Longolius' story, and the earliest printed composition in all probability of Pole himself.

After the death of Longolius—as though that had been a turning-point where he must choose between a continuance in the ways of humanist learning, beneficent and beautiful, yet fragmentary and merely reminiscent, which were the natural delight of minds like those of Bembo and Longolius, and the stricter rule of moral and intellectual discipline, belonging to the new age of Reform—Pole seems to have devoted himself more and more to theological studies. New friendships with men who were destined later to play important parts in the conflict against Luther mark the closing years of his stay in Padua. Thus through Bembo he was brought into relations with Sadoletto, who was planning his Platonic dialogues *De Philosophia*, and with Gian Matteo Giberti, Bishop of Verona, both of whom were members of the Oratory of Divine Love recently founded in Rome. Through Thomas Lupset, who, as a boy, had attracted the notice of Colet and had been educated by him at St. Paul's School, at Cambridge, and at Paris, and who now was living in Pole's house at Padua, he came into correspondence with Erasmus.

Pole's stay as a student in Padua ended with the brief visit which he paid to Rome in the Jubilee year, 1525. His neglect of the introductions with which he was furnished by Bembo, his surprise at the formal receptions accorded him through the well-meant offices of Giberti at every stage of his journey, and the fact that in Rome he never troubled to present himself at the Court of Clement VII, but spent his days in visits to churches, convents, and holy relics—all this is in keeping with the prevailing disposition of his mind. Shortly after this pilgrimage Pole returned home.

Twenty-five years later, the Cardinal of England, replying to the Bishop of Badajos, who had praised his

Cardinal Pole

"greatness of mind and fortitude," declared that those who accused him of faint-heartedness and indolence were far less wrong, but that he certainly believed that they were nearest to the truth who considered him *alarmed by the heaviness of the burden*; attributing this, however, not to the timidity that springs of its own accord from a faint heart without cause, but rather to the fear which will at times, for good reasons, seize even brave men. Certainly, labours and sorrows and the tragedy of his house had by that time closed in upon him, and the perspective is changed; yet it is not fanciful to trace a fundamental likeness between the portrait of himself drawn here by the Cardinal and the picture of the young student, *Domino Raynaldo*, "virtuous and grave" in his "gown of black damask," modest, silent, faithful to his friends, yet conscious always of a sense of contrast and separation, which we find in these almost forgotten memorials of his student life at Padua.

LEONARD PENLOCK.

THE FALLACY OF ARRESTED DEVELOPMENT

NOTHING is more certain than that God's Revelation through Christ is final and complete. The sum of truths revealed by Christ to His Apostles, and preached by them to the world, is a definite and limited number, which cannot be added to nor taken from. The deposit of the Faith is closed. It is beyond the power of the Church to make any of her children believe, as of Catholic Faith, more than Christ has revealed and His Apostles promulgated in the beginning. It would be a usurpation of Divine prerogatives and a crime against human liberty, if the attempt were ever made to impose dogmas, which were not as an actual historical fact taught by Christ and preached by His Apostles. To prove that certain tenets were not held as divinely revealed, say, by the end of the First Century, is to condemn them at the outset as extraneous to the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints. I say "to prove," for mere absence of historical documents to show that certain doctrines were held, is no proof, for extant literature of earliest Christianity is too scarce and haphazard to allow of the argument from silence. But any veritable proof that any doctrine was at any given time not taught as revealed by God through the magisterium of the Church is a proof that it can never be such till the end of time, for the deposit of the Faith is unchangeable and incapable of increase.

On the other hand, it is equally certain that, though God's revelation is immutable, the human mind is not. Man is essentially an inquisitive being. To arrest his intellectual progress is to force him to intellectual suicide. Man's intellectual powers will set to work on any truth that is put before his mind. To inhibit the process of intellectual development on any given truth is to sterilize that

The Fallacy of

truth and finally to starve it to death, or to provoke an intellectual revolt which will cast that truth violently from the mind's acceptance as something either worthless or alien and impossible. A statement a man is not allowed to think about, he will either mock as folly or hate as a lie. This is pre-eminently so with the truths of God's revelation, for the dignity of the Revealer, the unquestionable certainty of the thing revealed and the supreme importance of its right understanding to man's salvation, all act as stimuli to man's highest faculties to grasp and fully assimilate the gift of the Christian Faith.

The work of his mind on this Faith necessarily falls into four categories. His first task will be to study the very terms in which the original revelation is given, for this revelation was necessarily conveyed to him in human words and sentences, in the language of a certain time and place, in some set of human signs and tokens, which are only conventional equivalents for human concepts and reasonings. He will forthwith submit these terms to keenest study to analyse them and to gather what they involve. For example, let the revelation be that of the Trinity. It is given under the terms of: "God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost." Man will forthwith study the implications of fatherhood, of sonship and of breathing forth; and, having stripped them from all association with material things, endeavour to state what they contain. It took centuries to work out the essential meaning of sonship independent of material accompaniments and define it as *origo viventis a vivente conjuncto in similitudinem naturae*: the origin of a living person from a living person conjoined to him in sameness of nature. His second task must needs be a comparison of the different revealed data with one another. Revealed truths are not an incoherent congeries of statements, which can be held independently from one another. They are evidently closely connected, yet in many cases their very connection seems to involve an incongruity, for instance: Christ is truly man, Christ is truly God. How can anyone hold fast to both these truths without involving himself in an apparent

Arrested Development

contradiction? How must I accept the one so as not to render impossible my acceptance of the other? Faith does not consist in the repetition of a formula but in the inward and mental acceptance of a statement as true; this I cannot do unless I have some mental equivalent to the terms I use, and this is impossible unless my mind is free from a contradictory statement. It is impossible for any man to give two contradictory assents at the same time. I must therefore conceive the first statement so as not to contradict the second. The fiercest heresies of the past have fought in this field with the Catholic Church, which taught the distinction between nature and person, and that in Christ there was but one person, but two natures. Moreover, beyond reconciling apparent incongruities between revealed statements there is the task of grasping the connection between truths in some way correlated, such as the doctrine of the Fall, and that of Redemption, the doctrine of Grace and Freewill, and so on. It is an irresistible instinct of the human mind to desire to see the coherence of things, and God, Who laid that instinct in the human soul, cannot have excepted His own revelation from the operation of mental forces which He Himself created.

Man's third task is to compare the revealed data with truths of the natural order which are put before him. No man can think in watertight compartments. He cannot on philosophical grounds hold one statement and on theological grounds an opposite one. God cannot contradict Himself. His supernatural revelation by the Church and His natural revelation by the light of human reason cannot be contradictory, for both are equally His. The Christian revelation comes to a man, who has already a large stock-in-trade of natural notions in his mind. On accepting God's revelation, he will immediately start to compare the truths of immediate Divine origin with those which he already knows or thinks he knows. In many cases he will see how admirably the revelation he has accepted fits in with the deepest and greatest truths he already possessed and he will rejoice, in

The Fallacy of

other cases he will notice with alarm the apparent impossibility to reconcile notions long cherished with those coming to him by revelation. He will set to work at once to investigate and probe the matter to the uttermost. Often he will solve the problem by realizing that his former notions were in reality false and his mind will be completely at rest ; sometimes he will find that his former notions were quite true, but that he has mistaken the true import of the revelation and again his mind will be at rest; but sometimes he will find that some cherished notion is in direct contradiction to an undoubted revelation, and yet be unable to see how his natural notion is wrong. He will, in consequence, refuse assent to it, knowing that in reality it cannot be true, though it appears such and he be incapable of seeing the flaw in his reasoning. This may be a serious strain on his mind, but, if his will be steady and upright and strengthened by divine grace, it will make his mind function healthily by withholding assent to a proposition that cannot be true, because its contradictory is revealed by God, the source of all truth. None the less he may continue his studies in order to pierce the false appearance of truth of a statement contrary to revelation and in order to see where precisely the error lies, for few statements with a strong appearance of truth are totally false, but contain some true principle falsely applied.

The fourth task is the gaining of further knowledge by using revealed Truths as premises and forming therefrom inevitable conclusions, or even using one revealed truth and one truth known simply by his natural reason, and using both as premises to infer some further Truth, which he cannot indeed class as immediately revealed, but which he may consider as incontrovertibly certain and use as a principle of conduct and piety. Now in all these four ways God's revelation continually grows and develops within the human mind. Sometimes this growth is very slow and almost imperceptible, sometimes it goes apace, especially in times when, as in the present, a great number of new notions are presented to the human mind and a great number of new facts in the natural order are dis-

Arrested Development

covered, all of which clamour for admission to our intelligence and have to be readjusted to the truths already within our minds. It is almost similar to the readjustment immediately and irresistibly proceeding amongst the atoms of a material body into which some foreign substance is suddenly projected. In this sense Divine revelation is not static but dynamic, not only in the individual, for every individual during the short years from the dawn of reason to old age has to assimilate it for himself, but also in groups of believers and in the collectivity of all the Faithful. Hence the development of doctrine is the most entrancing object of study for the historian and theologian. It is the agelong story of man's reaction towards God's unchanging revelation. It is one aspect of the fulfilment of the Gospel parable that the Kingdom of God is like unto a mustard-seed that grows into a great tree, in the branches of which the birds of heaven dwell.

Now, with regard to this growth of doctrine, two main principles are clear, first, that, without the infallible guidance of the Church, this growth will become a degeneration and finally lead to the destruction of the original deposit of the Faith. None of the simple faithful are personally infallible, nor is any group of the faithful guaranteed against error; hence, in course of time, or rather from the beginning, the faithful will disagree in their conclusions and some conclusions will be erroneous and react on the original revelation and obscure it and finally destroy it. Without the power to give infallible decisions to arrest error and to sanction true interpretations, the Church would be complete chaos in a few generations and the original revelation worthless. Such decisions would in no sense whatever add to the original deposit, but only guarantee that among the ever varying states of human knowledge the original deposit of revelation should ever be understood in the same sense as it was first proclaimed by the Divine Founder of Christianity. There must exist the possibility of final and authoritative answers to questions which during the ages the human mind will ask concerning the true meaning of

The Fallacy of

divinely revealed statements, lest the human mind should imperceptibly drift away from the true understanding of them and using, perhaps, the same formulas should agree with the past merely in words but not in thought.

The second principle is this. This growth and development of teaching and understanding is inevitable and irresistible and therefore willed by God. It is this last point we wish to emphasize in this paper.

During the past centuries there have been many heresies. Heresies are obstinate errors regarding points of God's revelation. The heretic professes to accept all God's revelation, but refuses to accept the meaning put upon the revealed statement by Church authority, and obstinately adhering to his erroneous interpretation of God's word, he in reality makes God's revelation of no effect.

We are, however, not now directly dealing with formal heresy itself ; we are dealing with the efforts of those who wish to arrest the development of doctrine. They wish to do the impossible. They want to put the oak tree back into the acorn. They, being grown up, wish to think as if they were children. Again and again one meets people who plead in this fashion : " Why not leave abstruse questions alone ? Why cannot we be simple and believe as our forefathers believed ? They never troubled about these far-fetched problems and their faith was as good as ours." Catholics, who speak in this strain, of course, accept all authoritative definitions of the past ; these come natural to them ; they were taught them when they were young, therefore they seem obvious and simple ; but any possible future definitions of the Faith seem to them uncalled for and useless. They wish things could remain as of old. They will, of course, accept any definitions of a future Vatican council. The age of heresies is past. A Catholic may lose his faith and cease to believe, a heretic he will not become. Not in the Twentieth Century. The example of the Sixteenth is a deterrent for many ages yet to come. It means an infallible Church or nothing, to any intelligent Catholic. None the less he

Arrested Development

sometimes has a feeling that theologians had better leave things alone. However true definitions may be, they at least raise barriers between us and outsiders, and the simple faith of the humble Catholic has no need of them. More serious than this undefined feeling of a few Catholics with regard to the future is the resolute conviction of non-Catholics with regard to the past. The greatest calamity that ever befell Christianity was the definition of the Homousios in A.D. 325, said a prominent non-Catholic.

When looking back through the long vista of Church history, one seems to see it as an invariable occurrence that after the rise of a heresy and its condemnation a strong sentiment arises of inopportunism. True or not, why this definition, why could not matters be left as they were? Why drive all these people out of the Church for not accepting a term their forefathers did not know of? Thus has a number of people always reasoned. After the definition at Nicea, a strong party, by no means Arians, advocated the total suppression of the obnoxious term for peace's sake. They wished to express the ancient Faith in phraseology that had sufficed hitherto; they wished to go back to the *status quo ante*, before those fatal metaphysical speculations had disturbed the Church. They could not realize that they were asking the absolutely impossible. No doubt, many Ante-Nicene Fathers had used phraseology which seems now to us ambiguous; nay, in some instances, erroneous; and yet they had lived and died as good Christians. They had been baptized in the name of the one God who is Father, Son and Holy Ghost: this had sufficed for them. Some of them had fully, some less, some accurately, some confusedly, understood what it all involved. Owing to circumstances their attention had not been focused on the mystery. True, when Sabellianism had arisen a hundred years previously and asserted that Father, Son and Holy Ghost were only modes or aspects of the deity, nothing more, they had decidedly set aside the thought and had affirmed that these three were really and truly distinct from one

The Fallacy of

another, but the matter had received no further treatment. But Arius had challenged the Church of his day. God the Son was evidently God in another sense than the Father was God, said he. The Son in some way can only come after the Father. If Father and Son are both God in the same sense, then they are not two, but one, yet we know they are distinct. Hence he adopted the same solution as some modernists at Cambridge recently; when he called Christ god, the word god was conceived as an adjective, not a noun. When, in consequence of the Nicene Creed and the resistance of the Arians, the whole world was in a turmoil, a strong party pleaded to leave matters as they were before the fatal Council. The Arians were quite willing to call the Son THEOS: GOD; they were quite willing to say that He was not a creature in the sense in which we are creatures. Why force them beyond this? They had an unusual view of the metaphysical relation of God the Father to God the Son, but what did it matter? The question was avowedly one of great difficulty. In any case Arians baptized in the name of the three divine persons just as much as Catholics. It made no practical difference to their Church life, it need not interfere with morality, devotion and piety. Let us be tolerant to one another and find some comprehensive formula which will satisfy both sides and abandon shibboleths of party. So thought they, but the Catholics fought the battle to a finish. But for them there would be no doctrine of the Trinity to-day. Their resolute *non possumus* saved Christianity.

It was the same with Nestorianism. If anyone has read the *Book of Heraclides*, the last defence of Nestorius some twenty years almost after his condemnation at Ephesus, that almost pitiful and touching appeal of the old man tottering into the grave, he can realize what I say. Nestorius was quite willing in the end to call Mary the Mother of God. He was quite willing to say there was but one person in Christ, if he were allowed to use the Greek word *prosôpon*, which after all is the direct Greek equivalent to the Latin *persona*, if he were not

Arrested Development

forced to use the word hypostasis, i.e., subsistency. He was quite willing to pay Christ divine honour, for he worshipped the prosôpon of union. He vehemently repudiated that he degraded Christ or in any sense whatever lessened reverence for Him. The terminology he clung to was not new, great names of old had used it. By saying that there was one hypostasis, one subsistency, in Christ, you deleted either His human nature or His Divine. God and man cannot be one hypostasis, though they can be and are one person (prosôpon). Few persons even to-day can read the passionate appeal of the old man unmoved, and a feeling of irresistible pity comes to every reader, and almost a wish that the unfortunate exile might have died in peace. But the Church set her face as a flint: the word prosôpon would not do, for it hid an ambiguity, and to hide the Godhead of Christ under an ambiguity, was an act of treason. Though she lost millions of her children by her decision at Ephesus, she let them go rather than lose Christ. Nestorianism, though it lived a thousand years, is dead, but she still lives.

The story of the next heresy, that of the Monophysites, runs on the same lines. This heresy split the Byzantine Empire in two. Every political influence was used by those in power to heal this deadly division by adopting some formula acceptable to both, by forbidding anyone to talk about the matter at all, by going back to the *status quo*, before that wretched monk had raised a question which had set all the world by the ears. The position of the Emperors was embarrassing in the extreme, barbarian foes thundered at the gates to the North and to the East, politically it was absolutely necessary to be united. Curse the day that the question was first mooted! Why would no one forego his opinions for the sake of the good of the commonwealth, for the sake of Christianity itself? People good and holy seemed to be on either side. What conceivable good could come to *real* religion from a triumph of either party? So thought the politicians of those days, but the Church has higher interests than those of politics and she could never undo the decision of Chalcedon.

The Fallacy of

Then came a fourth heresy, that of the *one will* in Christ, commonly called Monothelitism. Then a tragedy was enacted, unique in Church history, a tragedy so great that a Catholic is filled with amazement and sadness on reading it, a tragedy that began with the fall of Pope Honorius, and needed the martyrdom of Pope St. Martin I before it could end. A Pope of Rome in a moment of weakness, in a letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, not in his infallible capacity, still in an official document, when informed of a new heresy, showed himself contemptuous and indifferent. One will, or two wills, in Christ? Why this refined subtlety of words, good for schoolmasters? So wrote he: "Leave it alone. My advice is, speak neither of one will nor two wills, and weary not your mind with speculations." Byzantine Emperor and Greek Patriarch both eagerly used the Papal Letter to prevent a further theological division from breaking up the Empire of the East. Alas, a successor of St. Peter had betrayed the Faith, by refusing to exercise the powers of his office, by neglecting to define, by impatience at the development of doctrine and careless dismissal of the question when it was brought before him. For fifty years did the Roman See struggle and strive to undo the weakness of Honorius. Pope St. Martin I, as a sacrifice of expiation for the fall of his predecessor, had to stand half-naked on a scaffold amongst a jeering crowd of heretics in Constantinople, before he was dragged to the Crimea, there to die a martyr's death from hunger and exposure. At last a General Council uttered its anathema against a Pope, who "by neglect furthered heresy," and the awful example of his condemnation was kept fresh in the ears of the priests for a thousand years by the recital in the Roman breviary. Never again did a Vicar of Christ forget his duty as Supreme Teacher, and tried to arrest development. During the Middle Ages steadily forward did the movement go under divine guidance. As the Trinity and Incarnation had been for six centuries the object of human thought, the restless mind of man now turned to the constitution of the Church and to the Sacraments

Arrested Development

of the New Law. The East would have loved to continue as they were, some loose federation of Patriarchates with a vague sort of practical primacy of the Roman See. They had on scores of occasions acknowledged that the successor of St. Peter had to confirm his brethren in the Faith, that no councils could be held without the sanction of the Apostolic See, that the See of Rome could judge all sees, but itself could be judged by no one; they had all signed the formula of Hormisdas which asserts the divine prerogatives of the Petrine See in an unmistakable way, but their national and racial prejudices began to resent too clear an assertion of the divine constitution of the Church. If the Chief Bishop of Christendom must be a barbarous foreigner from the West, an alien to that reputed home of light and learning, the Greek Empire, they must, indeed, bear it, but the doctrine of Peter as the Rock of the Church had better be left in decent obscurity and the question of the divine constitution of the Church not looked into too closely. At last out of national pride they broke with the See of Peter, and were forced to leave undecided the question that has clamoured for a decision these thousand years: What is the constitution of the Church of Christ? Where is the seat of its authority and how can it be exercised? Surely, to-day the question must torment them. For two hundred years there was no Patriarch of Moscow. Since the Russian revolution they have created one again. Is his authority divine or merely ecclesiastical and human? Are the bishops that refuse to obey the newly created patriarch and prefer a Holy Synod, still members of the true Church? Has Moscow, a mushroom See, authority over the ancient See of Kiev, and must the Christians in the Ukraine obey him? What is the authority of that phantom, the Patriarch of Constantinople, a Patriarch without faithful, for how many Christians are left to him now? But Rome, as the disintegration of the political unity of the Christian world proceeded through the invasion of the barbarians, through the rise of Islam, through the formation of nationalities, Rome with increasing insistence during the course of

The Fallacy of

ages defined the divine authority Christ gave to Peter and his successors, and Gallicanism made the Church set the crown of precision on the doctrine of Papal infallibility, the last of a long series of definitions during many centuries. The Eastern Churches having refused to face the question of the constitution of the Church, have remained stark and stiff and fossilized, and of their own free will have deprived themselves of an organ of doctrinal infallibility. Now that the storm has burst upon them, any historian realizes that their arrested development makes them impotent to react, unless they, too, face facts as the Catholic Church has done. No one can, without incurring the divine penalty of ultimate death, artificially prevent the development of doctrine.

It is of supreme interest to study how, during the Middle Ages, the doctrine of the Sacraments was gradually formulated with increasing precision. From the oath which Pope Gregory VII, in A.D. 1079, imposed on Berengarius, whereby he accepted that the bread and wine were "substantially converted into the true Body and Blood of Christ" to the definition of the Council of Trent five hundred years later, the truth of the Blessed Sacrament was guarded by unmistakable formulas. The unity, indissolubility and sacramental character of matrimony were vindicated by many Papal and conciliar pronouncements. Finally, in the Council of Trent the doctrinal development of the Middle Ages was summed up and solemnized against the Reformers, whose weird fanaticism drove them to what they considered "primitive Christianity," the "simplicity of the Gospel." These Reformers wished to delete fifteen hundred years of Church history, as if it had never been, and they imagined that to think vaguely and hazily about all revealed doctrines was the mark of a "primitive Christian." The only thing they insisted upon was that faith was not a mental acceptance of a revealed statement as true, but a mere feeling of being saved and a trust in Christ as Saviour; and that there existed on earth no authority that could bind them in Christ's name to believe

Arrested Development

any doctrines. Protestantism is the supreme attempt to wrest back the hands of the clock of time, the supreme denial of all progress. For Protestantism the perfect Christian is he who is capable of suspending his judgment on the precise meaning of anything Christ ever taught, if perchance he thinks he knows, of holding his conviction merely as a private view and personal opinion, possibly mistaken and of no authority to anyone.

Protestantism is a gigantic make-believe, as if one lived in the First Century, not in the Twentieth, so as to be able to say that one held the Faith once delivered to the saints. Catholicism holds that faith in real fact, unaltered, undiminished and without accretion, because it has dared to answer all questions, which generations after generations have asked concerning it, and it has made no effort to stifle inquiry.

Some, indeed, imagine that the Apostolic See suffers from a *rabies definiendi*, as if the Popes sought out and eagerly grasped occasions to define. Nothing is more untrue. Take Denzinger's *Handbook of Definitions*, a fairly complete manual of definitions from the Apostles' Creed to the decisions of Benedict XV, and it would be difficult to find a single one amongst the 3,000 numbers given which was not prompted, nay imperiously demanded, by immediate circumstances. In each generation the unchangeable faith passes through thousands of thinking minds, some exceedingly keen and gifted beyond that of their fellow-men. The very keenness and depth and difficulty of their speculation leads some astray. Instead of healthy development there is disease and danger of death. Obstinate souls refuse to obey, for intellectual pride is very strong. Many short-sighted folk plead with authority to leave them alone. Theirs is only abstruse speculation, it can do no practical harm. Why not leave such things open questions? Impose silence on the parties, if you choose, but leave them to think as they choose. Could not Tyrrell have been left alone? He might have died in the Church. Was not Pius X too ruthless with Catholic modernists? Some were highly

Arrested Development

cultured, most intelligent men, many seemed otherwise zealous and blameless priests. But God, Who made His Catholic faith a living thing, knows that it cannot live without assimilating all that is true and casting out all that is false, that to arrest such development would mean a death warrant for the faith in a living God, and He gave Pius X the strength to do what had to be done.

Public rumour now has it that Pius XI is going to call another General Council. It raises no surprise in those who understand the history of the Catholic Church. The era of the Councils is for us not a past phase of Christian history. The human mind is even more restless in this century than in the Fourth. It is as liable to err now as then. It asks as many questions now as the most inquisitive of the Greeks, sixteen hundred years ago. Evasion is impossible, studied vagueness a mockery. The faith though primitive is also the most modern thing of this modern era. Peter and the Eleven are as bold now as they were on Pentecost day. A Pope and his Bishops are as ready to-day as nineteen centuries ago to answer the crowd, when in these days of doubt and unrest they ask: "Men, brethren, what shall we do?" The Eternal City was never the home of arrested development.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

THE IRISH LITERARY PROSPECT

THAT the last two years have been barren in Irish literature is not remarkable ; but there are signs of a change for the better. Michael Ireland's *Return of the Hero* (Chapman and Dodd), a novel based on a classic hero-tale, proves that the "Celtic renaissance" is not spent, as many feared; for the author—one of the younger men, masked by a pseudonym—has essayed a new *genre*, and by ingenuity of treatment and beauty of style has added a notable achievement to Anglo-Irish prose. No longer can the critic justly say, as does Mr. Harold Williams in his *Modern English Literature*, that the Irish novel "has never in any essential or important manner differentiated itself from the novel written in England." In Gaelic literature, too, there are encouraging signs. *An Dochartach* (Dundalgan Press) is a folk-story, but it is retold with artistic skill, and holds the imagination like a romantic novel. With a more mature artistry, the writer could have refined the folk-crudities away and given us a story to rank with those of Stevenson and Conrad. In these two books we have an object lesson in the relative position and possibilities of Irish literature as composed in English and in Gaelic.

§ 1.

Taking the Gaelic story first—the latest, and in a sense maturest, thing published in Irish—we may observe in it the merits and the limitations of modern Gaelic writing. It tells of a sea-captain's voyage to the West Indies, where he impoverishes himself to save a white girl in the slave-market ; he buys her and frees her, and then sails away without apparently so much as asking her name. He lands in Dublin and a vest the captive had knitted for him is recognized as her handiwork by her mother. Her

The Irish Literary Prospect

father fits up a ship to bring her home. On the way, the good sea captain is treacherously marooned by a rival who poses as the girl's true defender. She begs the traditional year's delay before giving her hand. The true man, meanwhile, pines on the island. On the last day of the year he is mysteriously rescued by the ghost of a man for whose body he had secured decent burial (a thrilling folk-lore touch that could be artistically rendered by a Conrad), and on the eve of the wedding he arrives at the festive house like Odysseus, in rags. When the guests are telling tales he, a supposed beggar, tells the story of his own marooning, and the villain, describing the fit punishment for the traitor in the tale, pronounces his own doom.

Just such a theme gave us the *Odyssey* and *The Ancient Mariner*; here it is made into a vivid short tale of sixty pages. Mr. M'Coul is one of a little group of Donegal writers who are fashioning an art of Gaelic prose that has already provided two or three really readable volumes, and his present story is the best thing the group has done. The thinness, or *naïveté*, of folk-lore is relieved by delightful richness of idiom. The raciness of the language calls up images of the people and scenes—when they are not foreign or unfamiliar—more vivid than can be achieved in the Anglo-Irish medium. But once the story passes away from the scenes of Gaeltacht life—once the writer treats of life other than that of the people who are still Irish-speaking in the Donegal Highlands—then he becomes vague and his tale lacks imagery and reality. He takes us to the West Indies in name, but never describes the scenery or the atmosphere; he does not tell us how the people dress, what language they speak, nor even their race or nationality. He is like the old folk-lorists who told of the land of Sorchá and Persia on the sea: using names at random, never visualizing the unfamiliar. So, too, his tale contains logical absurdities, as when the slave-girl never revealed that she was from Ireland. Only by a sort of intellectual condescension can we enjoy the story. So with all modern Gaelic literature. It requires us to put aside our Twentieth Century mentality; to inhibit our

The Irish Literary Prospect

critical sense, and to forget all that Europe has learnt since the Renaissance.

When, on the other hand, we take up "Michael Ireland's" book, we have an intellectual feast before us. The book is as racy of Ireland as anything composed in English could be. Not that the difference of idiom is negligible. Nothing written well in English can be free of the influence of the English classics, or fragrant of the Irish tradition like a work well written in the language that has two thousand years of Irish life and thought and memory in its cadences. But nevertheless, *The Return of the Hero* satisfies our intellect while Gaelic literature so far only appeals to our emotions.

"Michael Ireland" takes the famous story of Oisín's return from Tir na n-Og, three hundred years after the passing of the Fianna, to encounter Saint Patrick and debate with him the merits of the old order as against the new Christian rule. The book is almost completely occupied in the debate, a contest, as it were, between the Natural and the Theological Virtues, brought into apparent conflict by the common human failing, very likely to prevail where the parties concerned belonged to far-divided ages, of being unable or unwilling to see the other side's point of view. Some of the clerics round the Saint are of the bigoted, intolerant nature that so often frustrates the work of conversion: even in the Gospel days, the disciples were over-ready to call for fire from Heaven. But Saint Patrick himself delights in the hero tales that Oisín relates in support of his contentions, and the deeper harmony between Saint and Hero is suggested rather than stressed.

The story is far from being a mere *jeu d'esprit*, or hanging of modern wit on an ancient parable. Considered as mere narrative, it is praiseworthy. The old-world figures are painted with strength and conviction, and the language put in their mouths is dignified and truly poetic. The author has woven into his own composition paraphrases of Gaelic originals, and this with such grace as never to suggest patchwork.

The Irish Literary Prospect

§ 2.

To consider the relative prospects of Gaelic and Anglo-Irish writing, let us glance at the history of Gaelic letters. We have first, ancient saga, personification of the Irish soil, that was the creation of forgotten races, and is the heritage of all that are born to Ireland. Later Gaelic literature is of indifferent interest, for art could not live in the turbulent centuries. And when we come to the literature of the revival we find an anomaly. It was the Anglo-Irishman who was moved by the Gaelic past to create the Gaelic League. It was the Anglo-Irishman who wrote the *Literary History of Ireland*.* And when the Gaelic League passed into the control of native speakers, interest in Gaelic literature died. "The scholars" were ridiculed, and of the whole school of Gaelic writers who have risen since, scarce one betrays a knowledge, or at any rate an interest, in the literature of the past. At the colleges and university no subject is studied more languidly than Gaelic letters. "The speech-of-the-people" alone passes a modern Gaelic censor. No one seems to love the flavour of Gaelic art. A Gaelic Elia is unthinkable.

The contempt into which Gaelic literature has fallen is not due to futurism, that contempt of the past which is due to saturation. No: it is simple insensibility. When we examine the literature of the Gaelic revival we find no originality. Of everything that has been written in Irish since 1893 only one book is really memorable and justifies the use of the Gaelic medium. A few pleasing lyrics have been written in imitation of standard models, but not one verse that stays in our minds like *Innisfree* or *The Folly of Being Comforted*. There is no drama. In a word, Anglo-Ireland, fertilized by Gaeldom, has given us Yeats, Colum, A.E., Milligan, Stephens, Synge, Corkery . . . But Gaeldom itself has produced absolutely nothing. This contrast cannot be explained away. Gaeldom has every encouragement to produce. In some years more Gaelic books have been written in Ireland than English,

* By Dr. Douglas Hyde (Fisher Unwin).

The Irish Literary Prospect

and publishers are crying out in vain for good Irish writing. Anglo-Irish writers have as hard a struggle, but it is in them to sing and story-tell. If the Gael had anything to say he could not be kept silent. Gaeldom, where not touched by the Renaissance element of Anglo-Ireland, has never moved beyond the mediæval folk-stage. Its critics dislike the individual note and Gaelic criticism is deadening in its Speech-of-the-People pedantry. It requires a Hyde from Trinity College, or a Pearse, or MacDonagh (both half-English) to infuse that lively appreciation of the past from which springs romantic zest for the future. The Neo-Gaelic literature is more remote from ancient Gaelic literature than is Anglo-Irish; this for the reason that the Sagas belonged to cultured classes. The tall poppies of Gaeldom were long since cut down. For two hundred years Gaelic speech has been impoverished and denied the uses of liberal life.

But let us not conclude from this that the Anglo-Irish race was a wholly foreign grafting on the nation, or that it was altogether hostile to national tradition. Let us forget the merely clannish prejudices (though we can well understand them) of some of the Gaelic poets of the Eighteenth Century. Remember, rather, how many of these same bards were patronized by, and sang the praises of, the landlords with the non-Celtic names. If these landlords were not Irish, what were they? English? A thousand times, no! They may have had interests in England, like the French *émigrés*; they may have deserted to England; they may have been agents of English policy. But they were not English. Read Maria Edgeworth's tales and contrast her characters with English squires. Contrast the Anglo-Irish ascendancy's heady oratory and wasteful splendour with the English character, and you will be convinced that even those who had no strain of Gaelic blood were, at any rate, acclimatized to something quite foreign to England. Their literature and their architecture had strong individuality. MacDonagh* has tried to prove that English spoken in

* *Literature in Ireland.*

The Irish Literary Prospect

Ireland has become a new language, and that Anglo-Irish poetry is marked by an "Irish mode" to which English ears are deaf. One need only read Boswell's *Johnson* to see how clearly Anglo-Irish men, not long after the Plantations, were already recognized as belonging to a distinctive nationality, different in manners and temperament, from the English. I believe myself that the Anglo-Irish ascendancy took over, holus-bolus, the manners of the Gaelic lords before them, and that their faults, as well as their merits, were in direct continuation of the past. At any rate, their attitude towards their tenants was no new thing in Ireland. It did not come from their different religion, although that new difference between the classes made fusion more difficult. You need only read Standish O'Grady's stories of the Irish chiefs to see that the subjection of the Irish peasant is of much older standing than the Plantations. If the new aristocrats failed to come into close relation with the people as in feudal England, the Gaelic lords had failed or refused before them. Anglo-Ireland took over a *damnosa haereditas* of class division. I cannot conjecture whether the fault lay in centuries of oppression—as one might suppose from Professor MacNeill's studies of the heady Celtic aristocracy—or in some slavishness of character in the toiling masses. The Gaelic historian, MacFerbis, writing before the fall of Gaeldom, describes the masses under the Gaelic lords in more contemptuous terms than ever a foreign bigot used, and his explanation of the already existing class hostility was that the masses were of an inferior race, the Firbolg.

The Anglo-Irish class then brought nothing new into Irish social relations. But it brought new blood, always a quickening influence, and the stimulus of modern culture. From it sprang all that has been distinguished in Irish history for two centuries. The magnificent architecture of Dublin was the work of the new spirit, and it was the only material expression of nobility that has ever flowered within our shores. And to-day it is falling in ashes. Difficulties in the way of fusion have been English influ-

The Irish Literary Prospect

ences on the Anglo-Irish class, and the conservatism of the Gael. The fear of Anglicization has often made Irish students reject the means of refinement. Our avenue to a wider culture has been the English language, so that the texts studied in our schools have been the plays and poems of the land which has been part of our tradition to resist. So often represented by the English as an inferior race, Irish people are slow to admit even to themselves admiration for things English. Besides, for religious reasons, English literature is necessarily less congenial to Irish readers than would be, say, the literature of Spain. And so Irishmen have never embraced all that England could give of beauty and joy: they have never accepted the whole heritage of the English tongue. But these difficulties might largely be avoided if, in our schools, English, whether as primary or secondary language, were taught from those Anglo-Irish writers who, as MacDonagh has shown, have created a distinct regional literature. The wider fields of English literature could be entered later without prejudice by the matured mind. At the same time, recognizing the natural fear, and also the real danger, of Protestant insularity, it would be well to encourage a wider knowledge of the Continental literatures than is common in Ireland. The native culture could probably profit more from familiarity with Dante and Cervantes than from merely intensive reading of English writers.

§ 3.

It is at first consideration curious that the Gaelic classics have influenced Anglo-Irish writers, producing poetic masterpieces in Dr. Yeats's verse, fine drama in several writers' *Deirdres*,* and now a very *novel* novel in *The Return of the Hero*; while writers of Irish seem to be ignorant of, or indifferent to, the literature of that language. The explanation is, perhaps, that those possessed of English (Anglo-Irish) education have imaginations trained to the appreciation of the spacious and the

* Since I wrote this article, Mr. James Stephens' *Deirdre* has been published. This notable re-telling of the heroic tale in novel form strengthens every word of my argument.

The Irish Literary Prospect

luxuriant, and the Gaelic classics belong to the richest period of Irish history. The impoverished life of the cottier cannot easily reach out to the Ireland in which exuberant young scholars made the songs they put in Oisín's mouth and the sparkling satires of MacConglinne.

Perhaps the Gael will appreciate his own heritage only when his imagination has gone travelling. At present, Irish-speaking children are mentally starved, while their English-speaking cousins read of Odysseus and the heroes of Asgard in Mr. Padraic Colum's beautiful books for the young. Gaelic literature must go to school; the Gaelic mind must grow up. Some of us hold that the Gaelic League could best aid the cause it stands for by getting good Irish versions made of the world's great tales, thus widening and enriching the Gaelic imagination. It is because he sees the Irish epics and sagas with a critical eye that the Anglo-Irish writer appreciates them and is moved by them as the men of the Renaissance were moved by the epics of Greece and Rome. When those who are lucky enough to have a command of the Gaelic tongue follow their English-speaking kindred in an imaginative realization of the saga's wealth; when they, too, see Cúchulain and Fionn and Oisín walking the Irish hills like embodiments of the sunlight and the wind, then with their glamorous and untainted speech they will, perhaps, create a literature beside which *The Return of the Hero* will seem but ghostly imitation. But if they fail of this intellectual rebirth; if their tales remain, as it were, cottage-bound, then the future will be with the "Michael Irelands" rather than the MacCouls, and the English tongue will prevail over the older dialect by the principle of the survival of the fittest.

AODH DE BLACAM.

THE MORAL ARGUMENT AGAINST BIRTH CONTROL

AMONG the advocates of Birth Control there are so many men whose judgment I respect and whose character I venerate, that I have thought it worth while to set down the reasons for which I, as a Catholic, disagree with their opinions and whole-heartedly disapprove of their propaganda. Of course, if these persons were convinced that the practice was immoral, nothing would induce them to defend or foster it. But they maintain that it is not, and cannot be, immoral, because it is for the good of humanity. By that they mean that, here and now, unrestricted childbearing is injurious to women, to the children, and to the State; that with modern methods no parity exists between the possible evil that may result from the use of contraceptives and the certain good that is achieved by them; and that this is a proof that there can be no divine law against the use of these devices. Now, were these premises sound, they would bear very strongly against any merely rational proof that God had universally and at all times forbidden Birth Control; but even then they would not be a complete proof of the contrary. As will appear, I do not accept these premises; but anyhow, I wish to start at the other end. I wish to prove first that Birth Control is against the law of nature. And, because this expression has proved liable to misconception, I would begin by defining its meaning. The law of nature, as it is spoken of here, does not mean merely an empirical generalization or even "a fully established statement of universal and necessary connection," as it does when we speak of the Law of Constant Proportions or of the Law of Gravitation as laws of nature; but it means the eternal, necessary Law of God, as manifested in the order of human nature as He has made it, and binding on the will of man.

The Moral Argument

We must suppose that the Creator in making the universe intended that every nature should achieve the end of its nature. For this purpose He gave it natural inclinations guiding and directing it towards that end. This applies to all natures, animate and inanimate, brute or reasonable. To deny this is to deny the wisdom of the Creator. Nature and end are correlatives: we can determine the one if we know the other. Those creatures which have no free-will must of necessity fulfil the ends of their nature; hence we can determine God's will in their regard by an induction from phenomena. Thus we arrive at the natural law in the sense in which the term is strictly used by scientists. From one point of view, this may be regarded as a mere statement of necessary connection, but from another we see that it is the reflection of the eternal constraining will of God—the Eternal Law. But as it is the will of God that every creature should act according to its nature, it follows that one section of nature, man, who is endowed with free-will, should act freely according to his nature. Hence it is that man, unlike the beasts of the field or the stars of the firmament, has it in his power to thwart the end of his nature, to misuse his faculties. But to do so is an intrinsic evil, that is, an evil which, arising as it does from the very nature of things, must be always and in all circumstances an evil. Man's nature is comprehensible by his reason; therefore the ends of his nature are known to him in greater or less degree. Hence his reason teaches him what is the will of God in his regard. That is why certain actions are said to be governed by the law of nature, which is a reflection of the eternal and necessary law of God; some are prohibited, some are commanded; but prohibition or command depends on the very nature itself, and is inseparably associated with that nature. When we say that Birth Control is against the law of nature, this is what we mean. It is not paralleled by the interference with nature of which we all approve in the act of a surgeon arresting the course of a disease; in such interference there is no disturbance of the immediate end

Against Birth Control

of any nature; it is merely the adapting of several agencies, each of which attains its end and must attain its end, for the good of the higher nature. If I put up an umbrella I do not deprive the rain of its tendency to fall, I merely use the umbrella for its end, which is to prevent the rain from falling on me. If in the laboratory I have an accident with sulphuric acid, and I treat it with an alkali, I am not acting against the nature of sulphuric acid; I am only preventing the nature of sulphuric acid from acting against me. But were I to drink sulphuric acid, I should be acting against my own nature and disobeying the law of God, for it is my nature to drink for the preservation of my life, not for its destruction. There are secondary precepts of the law of nature which are likewise expressions of God's will; such precepts depend on the needs of society in matters where these may vary; and God could conceivably alter these laws. Of such a character is the law against polygamy, which we know that God did not enforce in the time of the patriarchs.

It is therefore useless in the matter of Birth Control to appeal to the churches, as Lord Dawson did, to modify their law and so come into line with modern thought; the churches did not make this law, and they have no authority to repeal the law, modify the law, or dispense from the law. In the course of a recent lawsuit it was suggested that Catholics might reasonably have their own view of the matter, but that they must not expect others to submit to the rulings of their Church. Now, what I want to insist upon is this, that if our attitude is right the opposite attitude is extremely wrong; that there is no room for tolerance in the matter; and that the subject is of such capital importance that men are bound to make up their minds as to its morality in one way or the other. This is quite sure: if the Church teaches that this practice is immoral, she is not making it so in virtue of any merely ecclesiastical law which might be conceived as bearing only upon her own subjects; she declares that it is forbidden by the natural law. In so declaring, men

The Moral Argument

may say that she is right or that she is wrong ; but if she is right then the advocates of Birth Control are wrong ; and we need not hesitate to say that if they were right (which they are not) she would be in the wrong, in imposing upon men, with no possibility of dispensation, a burden very hard to bear.

But it may be suggested that she does not teach this hard word ; it has been asserted that this is merely the teaching of very fallible individual priests or bishops. Let us see what is the authority behind such teaching. First of all, the doctrine is universal. You will find no standard book of Catholic morality, no moral theology, which tolerates the practice of Birth Control. There could not be such a book nowadays, for the Holy Office has expressly condemned the practice, and an opinion which seemed to favour it was condemned by Pope Innocent XI. A decree of the Holy Office, dated March 21st, 1851, declares that it is prohibited by natural law, and another of April 19th, 1853, speaks of it as intrinsically evil. Now the framers of these decisions are (to say the least) men of acute minds, long experience, and expert in moral questions. It may be alleged that they are not experienced in the scientific side of the subject or in the ways of the world. But the question is not primarily a scientific one, but a moral. Experience of human nature, knowledge of medicine, economic laws may all be factors in the problem ; but that is all they are. And these judges of the Roman courts have access to all the best information of the world of their day ; and to accuse them of coming to a decision without weighing that evidence is to accuse them of an imprudence which is not usually associated with Rome. But there is a lingering impression that the true ground of any such decision should be the greatest happiness of the greatest number. One might insist that if that were so, happiness must be taken in a broader sense than any mere avoidance of physical pain or economic distress ; but it is shorter and more accurate to say that these are not the fundamental considerations at all ; to make them so is pure hedonism.

Against Birth Control

Nor let it be said that Catholic moralists, having no experience of family life, are incapable of the sympathy with human nature which is essential to a true appreciation of the bearing of this problem. That is simply not true. There is no class of men with a greater knowledge of human nature, of its difficulties, its aberrations, and its potentialities for good, than those whose daily work brings them the confidence of all classes of society and who are expected to give advice in all the most secret difficulties of the human soul. But what we must insist upon, if we are going to discuss morality at all, is the root idea of morality, and that is man's attitude to God in the performance of his human acts. We want to find what is God's law in the matter, and to that end we may proceed in various ways. But we shall do well, if this is our object, to take counsel of those whose prime concern in life is the discovery of that law; and these are the men who are responsible for the decrees quoted above.

Now a Catholic has often a very easy method of learning the will of God in serious matters. He believes that the Church cannot err in teaching faith or morals. If he can satisfy himself that any particular solution of a moral problem is the unwavering teaching of the Church as a whole, whether such teaching has been defined by oecumenical council or not, he knows with the certainty of faith that this is the correct interpretation of the voice of God. And I submit that, in view of the evidence given above, there is ample proof here that the common teaching of Catholic theology in the matter of Onanism is a part of the faith of the Church (in virtue of the *Magisterium Ordinarium*). But even if you do not go as far as this, there can be no doubt that the ordinary teaching is so authoritative that to question it would be grave sin and would bring the questioner dangerously near to heresy. I hasten to add that I should not expect this consideration to have any cogency for those who are not members of the Church; but for me it is the first, and completely adequate, reason for my position.

The next way to find God's will is to see if there is any

The Moral Argument

word in Scripture which throws light on the subject. In the thirty-eighth chapter of Genesis we have the account of the crime of Onan, the first recorded case of Birth Control by withdrawal. And in the tenth verse we read, "And therefore the Lord slew him because he did a detestable thing." Without any consideration of circumstances the thing in itself was "detestable"; that is what the decrees mean when they speak of Birth Control as "intrinsically evil." Here we have not merely the record of a person's conduct which might be good or evil, but the account of God's punishment of that conduct, with the particular reason assigned.

But now we will try to find in considerations of reason alone the justification of the assertion that this thing is against the law of nature, with the consequence that it is an evil which cannot be tolerated by any who respect the law of God.

First, then, I remark that the imperious sex instinct subserves a very definite purpose: it guarantees the preservation of the race. To use it while deliberately frustrating the purpose of its exercise is to act against nature and offend the God of nature. But, it is alleged, if this is so, then every time you eat an egg, you are frustrating nature and sinning. Surely there is an obvious difference. In the first case the man takes a pleasure, which is clearly designed for a definite purpose, and simultaneously defeats that purpose; in the second, it is clear that eggs are designed to grow into chickens in certain circumstances, but are meant for men's food in others. "But," my supposed antagonist insists, "you are begging the question. I deny this clear evidence of design. I suggest that, if there is any design at all (and it is a word I do not like) that design is to people the earth adequately with sound stock, and to foster affection between husband and wife. The advocates of Birth Control have both these objects in view, and believe that their plan achieves the Creator's will more perfectly than does yours."

This is very important, and it is a good plea. Let us

Against Birth Control

be clear, though, that there must be some justification for the indulgence of the sex instinct (eliminate the word design if you will); otherwise you cannot explain the perfectly obvious conviction in the hearts of men that some venereal excesses are hideously wrong; remember that there are certain sexual offences which in no way involve injustice, which nevertheless are punishable even in England with severe terms of imprisonment. Why is this, but that men see in them an uncleanness that is degrading and unnatural? Such an offence is punished because it is in itself a "detestable thing." I grant that the fostering of affection between husband and wife is a secondary end of the marriage act, and is sufficient to justify it, unless the primary end (the procreation of children) is at the same time thwarted; this is the common teaching of theologians to-day. I think nobody will question the significance of this distinction between primary and secondary ends.

Now we can penetrate a little more deeply into this very difficult question. I suppose it would be readily granted that if the practice of Birth Control were attended with pathological consequences, that this would be a sign that it was against nature and that therefore it was wrong; for surely no one would maintain that an act indulged in merely for pleasure, an act whose plain significance was subverted, and an act which in these circumstances was attended with physical evil to the nature which produced that act, could be anything but an inversion of the right order decreed by the Creator. Is this thing safe from pathological consequences? I am acquainted with the common evidence, at least, and in view of that I should say we are here very much in the dark. Those who profess to give a categorical answer to this question in either sense are merely guessing. The advocates of Birth Control allege that there is no evil to be apprehended from the practice, at least if it be carried out according to their meticulously precise instructions. On the other hand, their opponents produce a formidable list of diseases which are attributable to such interference with the

The Moral Argument

course of nature, such as, sterility, fibroids, frigidity, and all sorts of neuroses. Now there is nothing more difficult than to prove a causal nexus between a practice of this sort and supervening pathological conditions. An inductive process which should have such an issue would have to begin by collecting a large number of cases in which the disease in question was associated with the practice. Next it would have to investigate the cases in which one phenomenon was present without the other, and endeavour to discover why. Then it would have to inquire whether there was any concomitant condition in the first series which might be the real cause, or a part cause, of the second. Finally, it would be necessary to establish the causal nexus in the nature of the two series of events themselves. Every one of these steps is bristling with difficulties, and the whole investigation would demand the best efforts of the most highly trained minds.

Let us examine the last first, for here, I think, we might be able to establish an *a priori* case. It is to be anticipated that any positive interference with the course of nature will have its nemesis in the way of nature. Many people who, like myself, have a firm conviction that Birth Control is an unwarrantable thwarting of nature, find a satisfactory answer here. But that is not scientific proof. We have by analysis to find something in the cause which would of its nature issue in the effect; otherwise we mistake concomitance or sequence for causality, a logical error which is far too frequent in scientific inquiry. Begin with the experimental facts that sexual intercourse is accompanied by a high nervous tension, a rise of temperature and blood pressure, a quickened heartbeat. Add the recognized experience that gross excess in this matter certainly has a debilitating effect. And we may conclude that there is in every such act a loss of "nervous energy" (whatever that reality may be) which, if not counterbalanced in some way, will have a cumulative effect issuing in disease. In ordinary matrimonial intercourse there is a counterbalance in the satisfaction of a recognized impulse in a normal way.

Against Birth Control

Now one of two things may disturb this harmony. One is real excess. But in matrimony, with all its limitations accepted, this is checked. Such limitations are, periods when the exercise of the "right" is repugnant, fear of conception, periods of pregnancy and post-pregnancy. The efficacy of this limitation is reduced by contraceptive practices, and there is left practically no rein to desire. Surely we have here a strong indication that the strict law of marriage, as interpreted by the Catholic Church, is the law of nature as instituted by the Creator. (And this explains why divorce, solitary vice, and any irregular union are forbidden by the law of nature. For all these things open the way to excess in the use of an instinct which is ever clamouring for satisfaction, and which is hard to control.)

Again, if there be introduced a sense of sin, of shame, of secrecy, of defilement, this *conflict* may easily introduce a disharmony. If the particular method of contraception employed is itself fruitful of anxiety regarding its efficacy, it is obvious that the danger is increased. And that method which, as a matter of fact, is the commonest is open to this objection. But almost all methods are more or less open to this objection. In these circumstances nervous evils are to be anticipated, and as a matter of fact, I believe that here is to be found the true causality of such neuroses as are quite commonly attributed to the use of contraceptives.*

Briefly, the case from reason is this: The practice is unnatural in the sense that it involves a frustration of the order of creation; it defeats the immediate end of a natural human act; it leads to excess in the use of a function which demands serious control in the interests of health; it is probably attended by physical evils greater than those in fear of which it is employed; it is against the natural instincts of morality; hence it is opposed to the natural law.

I foresee an objection here. It is this: "By your

*Cf. Kelly, *Medical Gynaecology*; Huhner, *Disorders of the Sexual Function*; Kisch, *The Sexual Life of Woman*.

The Moral Argument

own showing, or at least by your acquiescence, the principal factor in the causation of such disease as is attributed to Birth Control is the instinct of sin or shame. But this is merely the effect of the age-long teaching of legalist priests. It is precisely of this that we want to rid ourselves." But surely such an objection as this could be made to every principle of the natural law. The sanctity of property is due to the cunning teaching of the haves-nots by the haves; the sanctity of human life is due to the superior brains of the physically weak. This is to undermine the influence of conscience altogether. To those who would take up such an attitude I fear that I have nothing to say. Similarly it is obviously useless to invoke the vengeance of God as a deterrent to those who do not believe in Him.

But there are further natural consequences of Birth Control which are often overlooked. Lady Barrett has spoken of them clearly and well in her small book on the subject. A large family and a full nursery, though they may involve certain privations, are for the greater good of the children. They will eliminate the danger of undue pampering, and will call for mutual service. A child brought up in the nursery without brothers or sisters has a handicap very similar to that of the boy who has never gone to school. The lessons of self-sacrifice, of discipline, of give-and-take, have been missed in the most impressionable years. And the very struggle for existence arising from a large family binds the parents with bonds that are far different from the shackles of slavery. Anxieties of all sorts are multiplied, but the sense of mutual support in the presence of such anxieties fosters an affection which, without them, is only too apt to decline with the years. Of course, the picture can be painted in another way—the worried, over-burdened mother; the fatigued father, finding no rest in his home; underfed children; slatternliness; improvidence born of despair—it has all been depicted for us over and over again. And alas! there is no need to impress these aspects upon us; we are far too familiar with them by experience. We

Against Birth Control

know it all, but still we persist in aiming at the high standard, undepressed by frequent failure. There are two ways of facing the situation: you can lower your standards (though, as I have maintained, the standards are not yours to lower), or you can maintain them, and do your best to encourage the sufferers to rise to the height of their dignity and face their troubles in faith and consciousness of the divine help. The Catholic Church has always taken one line; the Birth Control propagandist takes the other. These differences are fundamental; perhaps they are irreconcilable; but I would remark that there are spiritual values which can be produced as a set-off against the material advantages painted in so bright a hue by those who oppose the teaching of the Church.

And for the poor there is the future to consider. What are the material prospects of the widowed mother of one or two children when old-age appears? There is a tradition among our poor people, a tradition well established in the instinct of mankind and a distinct survival of a patriarchal state of society, that the support of parents in their declining years is a first charge on the means of their children. If those children are numerous, they can make a common fund, or the parent can move from one to the other at ease. But if there be but one or two, an old-age pension must be supposed to meet the case, or a Hobson's choice with an unsympathetic daughter- or son-in-law.

Further, it is to be supposed that those who deliberately choose to have one or two children, do so because they want children. But the accident of death has to be reckoned with, an accident which may desolate the home when it is too late to hope for other children to fill the emptied hearts. Surely this terrible lesson was borne in upon us with sufficient clearness in the late war.

Again, there would seem to be little doubt that deliberately to delay the onset of the first pregnancy is to risk disappointment when the time is judged to be ripe for a child.

The probability of evil consequences to the individual

The Moral Argument

and to the family is a further reason for supposing that the practice of Birth Control is opposed to the eternal, necessary law of God as revealed in nature, positively declared in Scripture, and traditionally taught by the Church. It is the sum of these considerations which I would put before any individual who was tempted to this practice. But unfortunately we have to deal, not only with the practice, but with the public advocacy of the practice. Of course, no right-minded man would try to induce others to a course of action which he believed to be opposed to the law of God and to the present interests of man. So that what has been said may be considered as an argument against the *advocacy* of Birth Control. But I am convinced that there has been much beating of the air in the controversy on both sides, because the antagonists have failed to distinguish sharply between these two phases of the problem. Considerations have been alleged for or against the practice which would not have the slightest weight with the individuals primarily concerned; safeguards have been suggested which, if observed, might remove some of the dangers, but which never would be observed. That is why I would now consider as a distinct question the policy of advocating Birth Control, while remarking in transition the pertinence to that question of the considerations which I have brought against the practice itself.

And first, at the risk of wearying the reader, I will revert to that element in the unnatural act which seems to me to be the one most fraught with danger to health; I mean the sense of sin or of shame, which is always present with some who do this thing, and which, I believe, is natural, at least in the beginning, to all. This, as I have pointed out, introduces the mental conflict which is the seed of psycho-neuroses. I think that this is a commonplace for all psycho-pathologists of whatever school to-day. Now experience teaches that this sense is rapidly disappearing among large sections of the community; patients who will hesitate to confess to solitary vice will in the most matter-of-fact and shameless way acknow-

Against Birth Control

ledge contraceptive practices. That is the natural effect of the widespread incidence of the evil and of the public advocacy which makes it respectable. But if there be any truth in what I have suggested above, this is nothing less than the blunting of the human conscience, the smothering of a natural instinct to virtue. Is this a suitable object for philanthropists to set before themselves ?

The unsureness of the devices used is not only a disturbing element in the act itself, but it opens the way to the possibility of the suspicion of infidelity.

To these various dangers the advocates of Birth Control are fully alive. They meet them by a plea for more careful education and instruction in the various methods. But in spite of very positive claims as to the clear superiority of this method or that, there is no unanimity among the authorities as to which is the "safest" method or the one least injurious to health. So that however sure an individual may be of his own favourite method, the public cannot be reasonably expected to share his confidence. And, anyhow, here, as in every other detail, this campaign neglects one consideration of the utmost importance. Granting the well-meaning philanthropy of these people who, realizing that they are meddling with human nature, wish to safeguard their instruction with all the precautions that science can teach, what are we to expect as the net result of their propaganda ? For every individual who practises Birth Control according to their ideal instructions there will be a thousand who practise it according to their own carelessness, whims or opportunities. They are *in effect* teaching that Birth Control is a good thing however practised, and all their refinements, limitations, solemn injunctions will, for the vast majority, go for naught. Surely it needs very little acquaintance with human nature to teach us this. The method which is the simplest is said by responsible people to be the commonest ; and it is likely to remain so, precisely because it needs no instruction at all, no preparation, no expense. The whole outcry is for the enlightenment of

The Moral Argument

the poor ; the poor will learn the essence of the lesson quickly enough, but the poor are not going to school again at the behest of doctor or philanthropist.

Let us look at other aspects of the question in the light of this same truth. Lord Dawson, in his famous address, demanded Birth Control, but a mitigated Birth Control. He looked for families of four or five "spaced" children. There are many who would hail him as a prophet, but who would not dream of having five children. Let us study and consider human nature by all means ; but it must be human nature as we find it. Nothing but a sense of duty to God will induce people to have large families, once you have shown them how to be rid of that burden without fear of natural consequences. We need not argue this ; we have but to look at the facts. What is the usual number of children born to those who begin their married life with the intention of control ? Is it not quite obviously two ? That is the number in France. The average in America seems to be much less. What is there to induce women to go through the difficulties inseparable from maternity if they accept the principles of Birth Control ? Patriotism ? A desire for the supremacy of their own superior class ? Such motives will hardly succeed where the fear of God fails. Of course there are many who begin to think of control only when their family is already comparatively large. But they are not the people who have learned the lesson before marriage.

Again, women are advised to have their babies while still young, to have one at least in early married life. Surely this is to be blind to the economic difficulty of relinquishing the double income and to the self-love which demands a few years' enjoyment before undertaking all the pains and responsibilities of childbearing.

Let us be honest with ourselves. If we are preaching the exact observance of the divine laws of matrimony we are making very large demands on human nature ; if others are preaching Birth Control they are deferring to the weakness of human nature. They may say we are

Against Birth Control

idealists asking of men sacrifices they cannot make ; but they are idealists asking of men sacrifices they will not make. We do profess to be relying on the help of God and the grace of the sacrament of Matrimony ; they are leaning on a broken reed.

But it is necessary for these propagandists to make such appeals if they are to justify themselves in the eyes of the public, for without these limitations their policy is full of danger for the nation and the race ; and the constructive part of their programme depends more on the saving clauses than on the essential teaching itself. They have, indeed, in the forefront of their consciousness the actually present pains and disabilities of the prolific poor, the wearing effects of frequent pregnancy, the struggle for existence—as we all have ; but also they are haunted by the spectres of war, of hunger, of disease, of the diminution of the better stock and the unchecked increase of the poorer. Race-suicide is an alarming possibility if mankind is to acknowledge no law but its own gratification ; pauperization is bound to increase if only the poor are “ imprudent ” ; on the other hand, food, even nitrogen, is limited, while population increases, they say, in geometrical progression, so that famine or war will have to intervene if an artificial check is not applied ; an industrial population growing beyond the limits of its own borders will expand even at the cost of war. In answer to all of which I observe :

1. That at the present moment there is very little danger of the over-population of this empire. All figures tend to show that the danger is just the reverse. And if the poorer classes once accept the doctrines of this new cult, this danger will be a very serious one, for they won't cultivate a small good stock just for the sake of the empire.

2. That over-growth of slumdom demands, not control of birth, but a facing of responsibility on the part of the governing classes, who should rather deal with the housing question, the emigration question, and the living wage.

3. That babies do not beget wars. If you say that a too

The Moral Argument

prolific Germany needed to expand her borders and so projected war, you must add that the empty cradles of France encouraged her in her ambitions. Of course, the fact is that wars are produced by the greed and passions of men, that there is room for us all in the world, and that natural law, or divine Providence, does govern these circumstances.

This aspect of the question, more than any other, is characterized by foolhardy interference. Can anyone pretend to-day that the laws of supply and demand of the human race have been satisfactorily stated? Has there been anything like a sufficient induction through the ages, a sufficient accumulation of modern data? The advocate of Birth Control resents the suggestion of race-suicide, but if a man tampered with his body as ignorantly as these people tamper with the life of the race, should we not be justified in calling him a suicidal maniac? I am not just now attempting to prove that the suggested remedy is not the right remedy; I am merely insisting that in the present state of ignorance it is wrong to employ it. Again, we do not know. We do know that the earth is far from full yet. England is overcrowded in its cities, but England's population is only 626 to the square mile; America's is only 14, Australia's is only 1.8. Australia is now eager for settlers. But little as I care for the argument, I want to be scrupulously fair to it. Perhaps it may be stated thus:

Indefinite increase of population must result sooner or later in exceeding the supply of food. And, alternatively, if this increase is checked only by "natural law," that only means that it is checked by disease, famine or war. These calamities must not be regarded as the direct act of God; they are actually caused by over-population. That, if it were true, would be a strong argument in favour of controlling births, for (prescinding from Christian principles and from sound philosophy which teaches that it is better to be than not to be) most people, regarding the question from a merely naturalistic standpoint, would say, "Better not have the population than have it ravaged by such

Against Birth Control

destruction ; better control it voluntarily than have it controlled cataclysmically from without ; better fall into the hands of men than into the hands of God ! ” But you cannot trace these things to over-population ; the causal nexus is lacking. It is puerile teleology to say that because they are found concomitantly, therefore these scourges are designed to prevent over-population. But if they were, if this were God’s way of dealing with the problem, then we have no right to take it out of His hands, and, as a matter of fact, when men do, they seem to make a sad mess of the business. But these are only bogeys, as Dr. Sutherland has well shown in his recent book.

Now I have granted that there are difficulties and privations to be dreaded in over-large families ; but in favour of occasional Birth Control much more could be said than this. Every missionary priest could tell of really hard cases which test the law ; of something more than exhaustion, anxiety, poverty and worry. Doctors will often warn a married pair that another child will mean the death of the wife, or at least a very grave danger to her life. Or, again, the case arises of an invalid husband supported by his wife, who could not continue that support if she became pregnant. Of course, it is now recognized that the threat of danger to life is greatly exaggerated, that with really competent care all through the period of pregnancy the danger can be indefinitely reduced ; still there are instances of women with complications, such as definite cardiac trouble, where the danger must remain very real in spite of all that the most enlightened midwifery can do.

In all such cases of grave and genuine danger to life or subsistence, the remedy is abstinence.* But at the word

* Intercourse limited to certain periods when conception is less likely to result is a remedy sometimes employed by those who, while they fear to have more children, cannot undertake total abstinence. It is to be observed that the possibility of conception is never absent. Of course, if complete abstinence is lawful, this partial abstinence is lawful too. Nothing positive is done to prevent the natural issue of the act. Conception does sometimes occur. There is some moral danger in the practice, for it may become the occasion of onanism, or it may lead to a refusal of the *debitum* when such refusal is unlawful. Still, the answer of the S. *Poenitentiaria* (June 16th, 1880) is clear : “ Conjuges praedicto modo matrimonio utentes inquietandos non esse, posseque confessarium sen-

The Moral Argument

"abstention" the opponent laughs at us for hopeless idealists cut off from the realities of life. How are a young married couple in the first flush of matrimony to abstain? And further it is observed that even if it were possible, abstention is deleterious to health.

But surely this is hardly fair. The hard cases do not occur in the first years of matrimony. Such difficulties as those mentioned in the last paragraph, could not occur then, except by extreme accident or egregious folly. When young married people deliberately refrain from having children it is, as a rule, either because they want to enjoy their first years without restraint of children or because they both want to work. Neither case will win our sympathy. From every point of view but that of utter hedonism they should have children, or at least should not prevent them. But later on, after two or three births, covering a period of, say, five or six years, when these grave difficulties may arise, abstention will surely be much less severe a trial. But at no time is it impossible.

Similarly, to say that it is injurious to health is far too sweeping a statement. It is more than possible that in some cases it would be, but there are some natures which find it very little privation, and in most cases the danger to health would not be very formidable. If it is a danger, that danger must be faced. Health is not the highest consideration in the world.

If abstention is injurious to health, and if that is a sufficient reason for condemning it, let us push the logic a little further. What advice should be given to a man whose wife is ill, to a man who, through being at sea or on a campaign, is separated for a long time from his wife? And if any spirit is so bold as to accept the consequences in their fullness, would he give the same advice to the wife?

Here an obvious objection presents itself. It may be stated thus: "You have argued that because Birth

tentiam, de qua agitur, illis conjugibus, caute temen, insinuare, quos alia ratione a detestabili onanismi crimine abducere frustra tentaverit." Cf. Noldin, *De usu Matrimonii*, n. 72; Lehmkuhl, ii, 851; Sabetti-Barrett, n. 943.

Against Birth Control

Control may be attended by pathological consequences, it is, therefore, an evil. But you allow that conception may be injurious to health and that even abstinence may be bad for man or woman. Surely it cuts both ways, and the most you can say is that the health considerations cancel out."

No, I should not be so rash as to take the health criterion as absolute, for, if I did, I should have to condemn hard work and asceticism generally as morally wrong. I consider resulting injury to health of individuals or to society as a confirmatory argument against a practice which on other grounds I have previously shown to be wrong. But the real tendency of these remarks, regarding the anticipated or experienced results of Birth Control, is that this remedy is not the boon that it professes to be. If, denying the moral evil or despising it, a person is led to these practices by the fear of suffering in one form or another, let him observe that contraception is likely to produce evil effects of its own as bad as those which he seeks to avoid. Virtue may involve serious disabilities, but vice cannot guarantee a care-free path; the right use of matrimony may result in poverty or wretchedness that will involve a charge on the State, but Birth Control is itself a threat to the life of the State.

Finally, to read some of the Birth Control propaganda, one might imagine that a normal family among the unenlightened would run to sixteen or twenty children. Certainly this can appear without any call for wonderment, but it can hardly be said to be common. Lord Dawson pleaded for families of four. But from five to seven is a much more common number than anything more, even when there is no suggestion of prevention. After all, having regard to the periods of pregnancy and lactation, allowing for accidents and possible separation and for the probable decline of fertility after the middle thirties, it would need very little in the way of self-restraint to bring the average to a birth every three years; and this would result in a family not much larger than that suggested as ideal.

Birth Control

The sum of the matter is this. There is a divine law against the practice of Birth Control. This is clear from the teaching of the Church and from Scripture, and it is in accordance with the testimony of nature itself. This, to the Catholic, is peremptory and decisive, and puts the whole matter beyond dispute. The difficulties incident to the observance of this law must be faced as other human difficulties are faced. We do not wish to minimize those difficulties, but we cannot be silent when others exaggerate them. The evil is widespread ; the issues are grave. We know how hard the observance of the law may be for individuals. But the Catholic Church will continue her age-long effort to stem the tide, bidding her subjects remember that they have the blessing of a sacrament specially instituted by Christ to enable them to fulfil with all virtue the obligations of their state. Others may continue to hold a view different from ours. Many of them, at least, will continue to claim our consideration as men intimate with human nature, sympathetic with its difficulties, and only anxious to ameliorate those difficulties according to the light of their own conscience. Is it too much to indulge the hope that they should recognize that here, as elsewhere, the Church's teaching, though it may be hard, is open-eyed, coherent and logical ?

T. E. FLYNN.

THE ELIZABETHAN PERSECUTION

NEARLY thirty-seven years ago, on December 9th, 1886, his Holiness Leo XIII, of blessed memory, gave permission for the introduction of the cause of beatification of 263 venerable servants of God who suffered in the persecution which raged in this country in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Nine of these have since been allowed the honours of equipollent beatification ; one, Blessed Oliver Plunkett, has been formally beatified ; and one, the Ven. John Ogilvie, S.J., has been transferred from the English list to the Scottish. That leaves 252 venerable martyrs, using that word in its popular sense and in no wise anticipating the judgment of the Holy See; of which martyrs twelve suffered under Henry VIII, 164 under Elizabeth, and eighty-six after her death.

Much hard work has been done during the thirty years which have elapsed since the introduction of the cause, and at last, a few months since, a commission was appointed by the Holy See to take evidence in this country. The Apostolic Process was opened, under the presidency of his Eminence Cardinal Bourne, in the Chapter room of the provost and canons of Westminster on June 15th last. The proceedings on that occasion were formal, but the court is now sitting for the reception of evidence.

Attention has been called to the martyrs and the *causa martyrii* by these events ; and it is felt that a brief account of the penal legislation may be welcomed by the readers of this REVIEW. Attention will be confined to the legislation of Elizabeth's reign which made acts of religion treason, so that it might be hypocritically said that the death sentence was for a civil crime and not for anyone's religious belief. But though the subject matter is thus restricted of necessity, for want of space, it must never be forgotten that very many, who did nothing to bring the martyr's crown within their reach, were grievously tried by the penalties of recusancy, for breach of the provisions

Elizabethan Persecution

of the Act of Uniformity, or by the more grievous penalties of *præmunire** or misprision† for offences closely allied to those which entailed death.

Elizabeth came to the throne on November 17th, 1558, and it soon became evident that everything possible would be done to extirpate Catholicism. Her first parliament met on January 25th, 1559, and could general obedience to the provisions of its first two statutes, the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, have been secured, the object of the Queen and her advisers would have been accomplished.

The Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. c. 1) re-enacted a number of statutes directed against papal jurisdiction which had been passed under Henry VIII and repealed under Mary. As a consequence of this Act anyone who, after June 7th, 1559,‡ should, by "writing, printing, teaching, preaching, express words, deed or act, advisedly, maliciously and directly affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain or defend the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate whatsoever, heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this realm," or should "advisedly, maliciously, or directly put in ure [i.e., practice] or execute anything for the extolling, advancement, setting forth, maintenance or defence of any such pretended or usurped jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence or authority or any part thereof," together with his aiders§ and procurers and counsellors should be subject for the first offence to forfeiture of his goods, or if these should not be worth £20 then a year's imprison-

* The penalty of *præmunire* was as follows: the offender was put out of the protection of the Crown (this does not mean that he could be put to death with impunity) his lands and tenements, as well as his goods and chattels, were forfeited and he was imprisoned during pleasure. See Denman *Digest relating to Indictable Offences* (1912), p. 475.

† That is the bare concealment of treason or felony: for the former the penalty was imprisonment for life, absolute forfeiture of goods and chattels, and forfeiture for life of the profits of lands, whilst misprision of felony was punishable by fine and imprisonment.

‡ The term fixed by the statute was thirty days after the end of the session and the session ended on May 8th, 1559.

§ One giving comfort, aid, or relief was not punishable unless it was proved by two witnesses that he knew of the principal's offence at the time the relief was given.

Elizabethan Persecution

ment, together with forfeiture, in the case of an ecclesiastic, of his ecclesiastical benefices and dignities; for a second offence he became subject to the penalties of præmunire; for the third offence he became liable to the penalties of high treason.

It was also enacted by the Act of Supremacy that "all and every archbishop, bishop, and all and every other ecclesiastical person and other ecclesiastical officer or minister . . . and all and every temporal judge, justiciar, mayor and other lay or temporal officer and minister and other lay or temporal officer and minister, and every other person having [the Queen's] fee or wages" should, under pain of loss of benefice or office, take a corporal oath in the following terms:

"I, A.B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm and of all other her Highness's dominions and countries, as well as all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm, and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges and authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, or united or annexed to the imperial crown of this realm. So help me God and the contents of this book [e.g., the Gospels]."*

Loss of office or benefice was the only penalty for refusing to take the oath, but four years later this was changed by the "Act for the Assurance of the Royal Power over all States and Subjects within her Highness's Dominions" (5 Eliz. c. 1). It was then enacted that the oath of

* This oath of supremacy remained on the state book till 1690: but from 1606 the oath of allegiance enacted by 3 and 4 Jac. I., c. 4, practically took its place.

Elizabethan Persecution

supremacy should be taken not only by those from whom it was required by the Act of Supremacy, but also, as Hallam says, "with an iniquitous and sanguinary retrospect" by all *who had taken* or should take (a) holy orders; (b) any university degree or (c) a degree in the common law,* as well as by other legal persons, members of the House of Commons,† schoolmasters and other teachers of children.

To certain persons the oath might be tendered a second time, and should any one of these for a second time refuse to take it after an interval of three months from the first refusal, he was to be sentenced as in a case of high treason, but it was especially provided that the sentence should not bring about either corruption of blood or the usual forfeitures. The oath could be administered for a second time to anyone (1) holding an ecclesiastical preferment;‡ (2) holding an office in an ecclesiastical court; (3) refusing to observe the orders established for divine service; (4) who depraved the rites and ceremonies of the established church; or (5) who *said or heard a private mass*.

It is obvious that under this statute not only priests but practically every educated Catholic of any position, went in peril of his life on the score of the oath of supremacy. But the Act went further still: it made the extolling of papal jurisdiction a capital offence on a second conviction,§ instead of a third, as was provided by the Act of Supremacy.||

* That is barristers and serjeants.

† Temporal lords of parliament were not required to take the oath.

‡ Hallam says that Parker ordered the bishops not to tender the oath to ecclesiastics for a second time without reference to him.

§ On October 30th, 1583 the Ven. John Slade and the Ven. John Body were condemned at Winchester, for high treason, for extolling the papal power: shortly after they were again indicted and again condemned on the same charge at Andover. The explanation of this extraordinary proceeding may be that it only occurred to the judges after the first conviction that two were required for a sentence of high treason. Mr. Anstey says: "It has even been holden (although two of the judges dissented from that construction) that a judge may ask a prisoner after conviction of and condemnation for a first offence, whether he be still of that opinion, and that if he answer in the affirmative he is guilty of high treason as having advisedly maintained the papal power a second time." [*A Guide to the Laws of England affecting Roman Catholics*, p. 31.]

|| In this case too, attainder of treason did not bring about corruption of blood and forfeiture.

Elizabethan Persecution

In regard to extolling by means of books printed within the realm, both printers and publishers came within the statute ; but not so those who merely received them and read them without approving them in conversation. The case of books printed and published abroad and brought into this country was especially considered by the judges ; and Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench in the time of Charles II, records* that they had all agreed in advising that in regard to such books the following persons would come within the statute :

(1) The importer that delivered them out to extol the Pope's authority ;

(2) He that read them and in conference with others allowed them to be good ;

(3) He that heard the contents and in open speech with others commended and affirmed them to be good ; and

(4) He that had such books in his custody and secretly conveyed them to his friends to the intent to persuade them to be of that opinion.

Aiders and abettors of traitors were by the common law themselves guilty of treason ; but in regard to the offences dealt with in this statute it was especially provided that " the charitable giving of alms to an offender without fraud or covin should not be construed an abetting, counselling, aiding, assisting or procuring or comforting of an offender within the Act." Commenting on this, Hale pointed out that in an indictment against an aider or comforter, it must be especially charged that he knew the principal to be a maintainer of the papal jurisdiction.

So far, then, capital offences were two in number :

(1) Between 1559 and 1563 maintaining the authority of the Pope after having been twice convicted of the same, and after the passing of the Act of Assurance in 1563, if once previously convicted.

(2) After the passing of the Act of Assurance in 1563 refusing the oath of supremacy when tendered for the second time. As a matter of fact, though Catholics were harried in other ways, there appears to have been no

* *Historia Placitorum Coronæ* (ed. 1736) i., 331.

Elizabethan Persecution

sentence under these sanguinary Acts ; for no one is known to have suffered martyrdom before the year 1570, in which St. Pius V, by the bull *Regnans in Excelsis* excommunicated and deposed Elizabeth, absolved her subjects from their allegiance and ordered them, under pain of anathema, i.e., the greater excommunication, to disregard her orders, mandates and laws. This was met in the following year by a Treason Act (13 Eliz. c. 1) and an Act against Bulls from Rome (13 Eliz. c. 2).

By the former of these the following offences were declared to be high treason :

(1) Within the realm or without, compassing, imagining, inventing, devising or intending the death or destruction or any bodily harm tending to death, destruction, maiming or wounding of the Queen ; or to depriving or deposing of her from the style, honour or kingly name of the imperial crown of this realm, or to levying war against the Queen within the realm or without, or moving or stirring to invade this realm or that of Ireland ; and by any printing, writing, ciphering [writing in cipher], speech, words or sayings, maliciously uttering and declaring such compassings, etc.

(2) Maliciously, advisedly and directly publishing, declaring, holding the opinion, affirming or saying by any speech, express words or saying that Elizabeth was not and ought not during her life to be Queen of England, Ireland and France.

(3) Maliciously, advisedly and directly publishing, setting forth and affirming by writing, printing, speech, express words, or sayings that the Queen was a heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel or usurper.*

Principals, procurers, abettors and counsellors were all equally guilty of high treason and subject to its pains and forfeitures. The liability of aiders, comforters and maintainers after the offence was limited by the words, " knowing the same offence or offences to be done and committed in any place within this realm or without " : and in the case of those who affirmed the Queen to be " a heretic,

* This followed the Treason Act of 1534.

Elizabethan Persecution

schismatic, tyrant, infidel or usurper " the penalties of high treason were only incurred upon a second conviction : for the first offence the penalties of præmunire were awarded.

Lord Chief Justice Hale notes that most of the offences declared by this Act to be treasons were already treasons under the statute of Edward III, and that the object was to provide new remedies and to settle a doubt as to whether a bare manifestation by word of a compassing of the death or bodily harm of the Queen, or depriving her of her crown, or levying war against her, was sufficient to constitute treason : the Act left no doubt as to the criminal sufficiency of words. Hale observes that as little as possible was left to judicial construction, the words must be spoken or written " maliciously, advisedly and directly " ; defamatory words, " though of a very high nature," he added, " do not always make treason ; there cannot be more venomous words ordinarily thought of than to say the Queen was a heretic, schismatic, tyrant, usurper, yet an Act of Parliament was necessary to make them treason." He points out too, that regularly in a new treason the aiding and comforting of traitors, knowing them to be such, makes a man guilty of treason, and therefore care was taken by express provision to make the offence a præmunire : and that for the second offence to be treason it must be actually committed after a previous conviction.

In regard to charitable relief the Act provided that the giving of " charitable alms in money, meat, drink, apparel or bedding for the sustentation of the body or health of any person or persons that shall commit any of the offences made treason or præmunire by this Act during the time that the same offender shall be in prison, shall not in any wise be deemed or taken to be any offence." Hale notes that this " was a necessary provision to avoid question. Regularly," he says, " relief by victuals or clothes of a felon or a traitor after he is in custody or under bail*

* Hale remarks that if a man be bailed it is the same as if he were still in custody, as the bail in law were his keepers : a man who was " delivered in bail in the King's Bench was nevertheless said to be *in custodia mariscalli*."

Elizabethan Persecution

makes not a man an accessory in felony or a principal in treason : but if he help him to escape, that makes him an accessory in one case and a principal in the other."

Hale's explanation of the law is interesting in the light of the condemnation for felony in 1594 of the Ven. Thomas Bosgrave for aiding a priest. The facts are almost incredible and it will be best to quote the actual words of Bishop Challoner. The Ven. John Cornelius had been arrested by the sheriff, and as he was being hurried away to prison without a hat, Mr. Bosgrave "clapped his own hat upon the confessor's head saying: 'The honour I owe to your function will not allow me to see you go bareheaded.' Upon which the sheriff told him he should bare him company; and . . . for this offence he afterwards also suffered with him." He was hanged as a felon on July 4th, 1594, at Dorchester. It is true that the holy priest was not actually in prison, but he was already in custody.

Another case in connection with this Act in which the law was driven very hard had occurred three years earlier. In 1591 the Ven. Laurence Humphrey, a convert and, like Ven. Thomas Bosgrave, a layman, suffered the horrible death of a traitor for having called Queen Elizabeth a harlot and a heretic when he was in delirium.* But, apart from the general injustice of the persecuting laws, there were many unjust convictions in Tudor times.

The second of the 1571 Acts, that against Bulls from Rome (13 Eliz. c. 2), recited that in spite of the provisions of 5 Eliz. c. 1, against papal jurisdiction, divers persons had procured Bulls and writings "the effect whereof had been" and was "to absolve and reconcile all those that will be contented to forsake their due obedience" to the Queen and subject themselves to the papal authority; that certain "simple and ignorant persons" had "been contented to be reconciled to the said usurped authority of the see of Rome"; and that great disobedience and boldness had grown in many, not only to withdraw themselves "from all divine service now most godly set forth

* *Catholic Encyclopædia.*

Elizabethan Persecution

and used within this realm, but also [had] thought themselves discharged from all obedience, duty and allegiance to her majesty." It was therefore enacted that every person should be deemed guilty of high treason, together with his procurers, abettors, and counsellors, who :

(1) After July 1st, 1571, should put in practice within the Queen's dominions any papal Bull, writing or instrument of absolution or reconciliation ; or

(2) After July 1st, 1571, should willingly receive such absolution or reconciliation ; or

(3) After May 8th, 1559,* should have obtained or after July 1st, 1571, should obtain or get any kind of Bull, writing or instrument from the Pope ; or

(4) Should publish or put in practice such Bull or instrument.

Between the promulgation of *Regnans in Excelsis* and the passing of these two Acts, two of those already beatified were put to death, and in the course of the following ten years six more of them shared their fate. Those ten years were an eventful period in the history of Christianity in this country, for during it the seminary priests and the Jesuits appeared on the scene. The first Jesuit to be martyred was the Blessed Thomas Woodhouse,† who won his crown in 1573. In the following year the first of the priests educated in the English seminaries on the Continent returned to his native land, to be followed during the coming years by a host of others : and within three years or so of the arrival of the first they had their proto-martyr, the Blessed Cuthbert Mayne, who suffered at Launceston on November 29th, 1577. The coming of the seminary priests was a matter of deep concern to the government : it was no longer a question of Catholicism dying a slow death of inanition : if it were to be blotted out active extirpation had become a necessity. In the words of a Protestant writer, "The establishment of the English colleges beyond the seas struck a deadly blow at the Eliza-

* That is after the last day of the first parliament of Elizabeth.

† He was a Marian priest who had been admitted to the Society without having to leave this country, shortly before his martyrdom.

Elizabethan Persecution

bethan Church settlement. The Bull of excommunication had checked conformity: the seminary priests succeeded for a time in stopping conformity altogether. Under their influence the Catholic families ceased to bow themselves in the house of Rimmon and a marked revival of active Catholicism took place in England.*

One result of this increased activity was the "Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's Subjects in their due Obedience" (13 Eliz. c. 1) by which it was enacted in 1581 that:

(1) Anyone who should "absolve, persuade or withdraw any within the realm from their allegiance to the Queen," or *for that intent* should withdraw them from the established religion to the "Romish religion," or move them to submit to the Pope, or should do any overt act for that intent, should be adjudged a traitor.

(2) Anyone willingly absolved or withdrawn from his allegiance to the Queen, or reconciled or having promised obedience to the Pope, should suffer "as in a case of treason," together with his or her procurers and counselors.

Lord Chief Justice Hale points out in regard to the Elizabethan statute that the words "for that intent" [withdrawal from their allegiance to the Queen] runs through the whole clause of dissuading from the religion of the Church of England, which, he says, seems to be the book of articles enjoined to be assented to by all men taking orders by the statute 13 Eliz. c. 12.

The Act against Bulls from Rome of 1571 added three to the list of capital offences: (1) obtaining a Bull from the Pope; (2) publishing or making use of any papal Bull; (3) being willingly reconciled. The Act of 1581 added one more, the withdrawing of anyone from the established church to the "Romish Church," or moving him to submit to the Pope *with the intent*, on the part of the persuader, of withdrawing such a one from his allegiance to the Queen. It also provided the punishment of high treason for anyone who should be reconciled to the Pope: this

* Tanner, *Tudor Constitutional Documents* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 150.

Elizabethan Persecution

had also been enacted by the Bulls Act in 1571 and was perhaps re-enacted to make it quite clear that the reconciliation need not be the consequence of any papal Bull.

Between the beginning of June, 1571, and May 8th, 1585, when the persecution entered on a new phase, thirty-four of the martyrs (twenty-two secular priests, five Jesuits, and seven laymen) laid down their lives, of whom twenty-one (fifteen secular priests, five Jesuits and one layman) have already been beatified. They must have been charged under at least one of four Acts, 5 Eliz. c. 1, 13 Eliz. cc. 1 and 2, 23 Eliz. c. 1, and it is of some interest to note the charges on which they were actually arraigned and the shifts to which their persecutors were driven.

Blessed Thomas Woodhouse, S.J., was apparently arraigned on the charge of denying the Queen's supremacy. It may be presumed that the oath was tendered to him before he was originally committed to the Fleet prison in 1561 : and a second refusal at the time of his examination by the Council would have been sufficient to secure his conviction. He might have been indicted for extolling the papal jurisdiction, but there is no evidence of a former conviction.

Six indictments laid against Blessed Cuthbert Mayne comprised charges of treason and others as follows :

(1) That he had on a stated day traitorously obtained from the Roman See a printed faculty containing matter of absolution of sundry subjects of the kingdom.

(2) That on a day named he had traitorously published the said document at Galton.

(3) That on another day he had at Launceston maliciously and with evil intent taught and defended in express words the ecclesiastical power of a foreign bishop, to wit, the Bishop of Rome.

(4) That on a certain day he had brought into the kingdom a vain and superstitious thing, commonly called an Agnus Dei, blessed, as they say, by the said Bishop of Rome, and had delivered the same to Mr. Francis Tregian.

Elizabethan Persecution

(5) That he had publicly said mass and administered the Lord's Supper according to the Popish rite—all these things being contrary to statutes made in the first and thirteenth years of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth and against her peace, crown and dignity.*

The draftsman of these indictments must have been hard put to it. Two of the charges were not punishable by death. A third required a previous conviction which was not alleged. The only two which were *prima facie* useful for the required end were those relating to the obtaining and publication of a papal Bull. But the Bull had not been obtained from Rome: it was a copy, printed at Douay, of the Bull for the jubilee of 1575 which was out of date before the accused priest left for England, where he was certainly not foolish enough to publish an out-of-date document. The jury disagreed and only gave a verdict when, with indecent illegality, they were urged thereto by the high sheriff. The two judges disagreed and one of them referred the matter to the Privy Council, who in turn referred it to the whole body of judges. They, too, differed in their opinions; but the Council would not be balked of its prey and Blessed Cuthbert was handed over to the executioner.

The next in order was Blessed John Nelson, S.J.,† who was condemned probably for declaring, when examined by the commissioners, that the Queen was either a heretic or a schismatic. There were other matters, the supremacy and extolling the papal power, but that suggested was the only one which was legally sufficient for a capital charge. Blessed Thomas Sherwood, a layman, who followed Blessed John Nelson on the road to martyrdom, was certainly indicted and condemned for having called the Queen either a heretic or a schismatic.

Then came the Act of 1581; and the first to suffer under it, Blessed Everard Hanse, a secular priest, was indicted for "persuading." The matter for that count was obtained

* Morris, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers* i, 71-75.

† Like Blessed Thomas Woodhouse, he was originally a secular priest, and like him was admitted into the Society, without leaving England.

Elizabethan Persecution

during his examination before arraignment by the recorder asking him whether his various answers had been given with that intent : to which he had replied that he did not know what was intended by the word "persuade," but he would fain that all believed the Catholic faith from their hearts as he did. There were other counts : that he had extolled the papal authority, that he had declared that he hoped the Pope had not erred in pronouncing the Queen a heretic and depriving her of her kingdom, and that he had come back to England to withdraw the Queen's subjects from their obedience.

In the light of subsequent events, this last mentioned count which stood first in the indictment is not without significance. It looks as if the government for some reason thought that an ordinary charge of treason was to be preferred to one depending on doctrinal matters : it may be that, as Father Keogh suggests,* the government wanted a more presentable charge than those which procured the martyrdoms of 1577 and 1578 and thereby had brought great odium upon it. Certain it is that a story of a conspiracy in Rome and Rheims was trumped up. It was not believed by the Queen, that is admitted by Camden : but it sufficed to bring about the martyrdoms of no fewer than sixteen priests—the BB. Edmund Campion, S.J., Ralph Sherwin, Alexander Briant, S.J., John Payne, Thomas Ford, John Short, Robert Johnson, William Filby, Luke Kirby, Laurence Richardson and Thomas Cottam, S.J., and the VV. James Fenn, George Haydock, Thomas Hemerford, John Nutter and John Munden.

The following fact will serve as a specimen of the kind of evidence on which they were convicted. On February 5th, 1584, the Ven. James Fenn was indicted with the Ven. George Haydock and others for having conspired together against the Queen at Rheims on September 20th, 1581. When asked what he had to say, he pointed out that on the day in question he was in England and in prison, and that, in fact, he had never seen Mr.

* Camm, *Lives of English Martyrs*, II, 431.

Elizabethan Persecution

Haydock before the previous day when they met in the dock.

Probably no one believed in the conspiracy ; but the missionary priests had to be got rid of and evidence could be easily suborned and would not be too closely examined by a hostile court. As has been said, it served its purpose in the case of sixteen priests and only six are left to be accounted for : they all suffered in the North, five at York and one at Lancaster. Three of them were martyred for reconciling converts : they were the BB. James Thompson,* Richard Thirkeld and the Ven. James Bell ; of the other three, B. William Lacey was probably put to death for having procured a dispensation from Rome ; B. William Hart for having left the realm without the royal permission, though other matters were brought in, and B. Richard Kirkman for persuading the Queen's subjects to embrace the Catholic religion.

It has been already suggested that the government had come to prefer a simple issue, which in the case of sixteen priests had been found in a wild charge of conspiracy. It must have occurred to some of those responsible for the persecution that even this was hardly safe, though it had answered the purpose for a time. If many were condemned for conspiracy in Rome or Rheims at a time when they chanced to be not only in England but actually in the custody of the English executive, awkward questions would assuredly arise. There was one simple issue which could be easily proved, that of being a priest. The Act against Reconciliation to Rome of 1581 was followed in 1585 by an Act against Jesuits, Seminary Priests and such other like disobedient Persons, which when introduced into the House of Commons had been styled a Bill for the Utter Extirpation of Popery.† Doubtless the political situation brought about by the murder of William the Silent, between five and six months before the introduction of the Bill, might account for the particular form the

* Though condemned for treason he was only hanged.

† For an account of this Act and the political conditions of the moment see the articles by Father Pollen, S. J., in *The Month* for January and March, 1922.

Elizabethan Persecution

Bill took, but all the same the conspiracy business showed that something simple was wanted, and what could be simpler than a condemnation for priesthood received abroad when the popular conscience had been sufficiently deadened.

In fact, the Act against Jesuits and Seminary Priests (27 Eliz. c. 2), which became law on March 29th, 1585, is by far the most important of the persecuting statutes, for under it no fewer than 181 out of the 240 who suffered after the publication of *Regnans in Excelsis* went to their death, and of these 147 were priests.* By this it was enacted:

(1) That all priests ordained abroad by papal authority since June 24th, 1559, should depart from the Queen's dominions within forty days after the end of that session of parliament, or so soon after as the weather should allow.

(2) That no such priest, no deacon, no other religious or ecclesiastical person, born within the Queen's dominions and ordained by papal authority, should remain in or come into the country after the end of the said forty days, under pain of being adjudged a traitor.

(3) That any person who after the expiry of the said forty days should knowingly and willingly receive, relieve, comfort, aid or maintain any such priest, etc., knowing him to be such, should be adjudged a felon without benefit of clergy.

(4) That any of her Majesty's lay subjects then being educated abroad in any seminary or Jesuit college who, after proclamation on that behalf had been made in the City of London, should not within six months return to England and within two days after such return take the oath of supremacy, should, when he did return to this country, be adjudged a traitor.

Thus two new treasons and one new felony were enacted, and it might be thought that the ingenuity of the persecutors was then exhausted. But the list was added to eight years later by the Act against Popish

* *Ibid.*

Elizabethan Persecution

Recusants of 1593 (35 Eliz. *c.* 2), which rendered it obligatory for every natural born subject, or person made denizen, above the age of 16, who before the end of that session of parliament should have been convicted of recusancy to repair to his ordinary place of residence within forty days from the end of the session and not to go anywhere beyond a distance of five miles from it under pain of absolute forfeiture of goods and chattels, together with forfeiture of lands, tenements, hereditaments, rents and annuities for life. Anyone not possessed of an estate worth a clear twenty marks a year, or goods and chattels worth more than forty pounds, who should fail to repair to the allotted place within the appointed time, or should remove more than five miles from that place, or should not conform to the law of attendance at church within three months after being apprehended, was required to take a corporal oath to abjure the realm for ever. Should he refuse to make the abjuration, or having made it not go to the appointed port for the purpose of leaving the realm, or should not depart from the realm, or after departure should return without having obtained a licence to do so, he was then to be adjudged a felon without benefit of clergy.

The net result of these statutes was that condemnation to a traitor's death was the sentence for any one of the following acts :

(1) After the passing of the Act of Assurance early in 1563 (5 Eliz. *c.* 1) extolling the jurisdiction of the Pope, or aiding and abetting another in so doing, having been previously convicted of the same. Between the passing of the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. *c.* 1) and the above date, two previous convictions had been required for the passing of the capital sentence.

(2) A second refusal to take the oath of supremacy, an interval of three months having elapsed after the first refusal (5 Eliz. *c.* 1).

(3) Making use of any papal Bull, writing or instrument of absolution or reconciliation after July 1st, 1571 (13 Eliz. *c.* 2).

Elizabethan Persecution

(4) Willingly receiving such absolution or reconciliation. (*Ibid.*)

(5) Obtaining any Bull, writing, or instrument from the Pope. (*Ibid.*)

(6) Publishing or putting in practice such Bull, writing, or instrument. (*Ibid.*)

(7) Aiding and abetting in any case included in nos. 3-6. (*Ibid.*)

(8) From 1581, absolving, persuading, or withdrawing any of the Queen's subjects from their allegiance within the realm, or *for that intent* withdrawing them from the Protestant religion to the Catholic, or moving them to submit to the Pope. (23 Eliz. c. 1.)

(9) For being reconciled to the Pope[? within the realm]. (*Ibid.*)

(10) If a priest ordained abroad by papal authority or other religious or ecclesiastical person, remaining in or coming to England after May 8th, 1585.* (*Ibid.*)

(11) Being a subject of the Queen and being educated abroad in a seminary or Jesuit college, not returning to England within six months after proclamation made and, within two days after such return, taking the oath of supremacy. (*Ibid.*)

These eleven cases entailed a traitor's death: in two others that of a felon was decreed:

(1) That of knowingly and willingly receiving, comforting, aiding, or maintaining any priest ordained abroad by papal authority, or other religious or ecclesiastical person who should remain in or come into the realm after May 8th, 1585. (27 Eliz. c. 2.)†

(2) That of a person who under the Act against Popish Recusants (1593) had been required to abjure the realm should refuse to do so, or after abjuration should not leave the realm from a specified port, or having left should return without permission. (35 Eliz. c. 2.)

In both these cases benefit of clergy was denied, that is,

* That is after a lapse of forty days from the end of the session of parliament, 27 Eliz.

† *Ibid.*

Elizabethan Persecution

branding was not allowed as a substitute for hanging for the first conviction.

Between the passing of the Act against Jesuits and Seminary Priests and the death of Elizabeth, that is, during a period of eighteen years, less five days, 150 of the English martyrs were executed for treason or felony, and another, Philip, Earl of Arundel, died in prison : of those executed, 95 were secular priests, 5 were Jesuits, 1 a Benedictine, 1 a Dominican, 3 Franciscans, and 59 laymen : before the passing of that Act 23 secular priests, 5 Jesuits and 10 laymen had met a like fate. That makes the number of martyrs (who have already been declared Blessed or Venerable) under Elizabeth 189—118 secular priests, 10 Jesuits, 5 other religious, and 69 laymen. Of the 133 priests all but one suffered the penalties of high treason for one supposed offence or another, the great majority simply for being priests and coming to this country. One priest was hanged for felony.* The majority of the laymen, too, were executed for felony, for aiding and harbouring priests : but a considerable number were treated as traitors—for being reconciled to the church, for persuading others to be reconciled, for extolling the power of the Pope, one for calling the Queen a heretic when he was in delirium, one for procuring a marriage dispensation from Rome. The net was wide and the victims many.

In conclusion it may be well to set out exactly the punishments for treason and felony : it enables one to realize more vividly what these heroes had before their eyes when they deliberately violated the persecuting laws. A felon was hanged till he was dead ; the hanging, however, was not the swift painless process of the present day, but a slow strangling. Bad as this must have been, it was but a trifle in comparison with the hideous penalty for treason,† the details of which are set out in an en-

* The Ven. Thomas Alfield, the last executed before the passing of 27 Eliz., c. 2. His offence was the bringing into England and distributing Cardinal Allen's *Defence of English Catholics*, and he was indicted under 23 Eliz., c. 2, which made slandering the Queen a felony.

† It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that this inhuman punishment

Elizabethan Persecution

dorsement on the indictment of the Ven. Peter Wright, S.J. (1650): "He shal be led backe againe to the place whence he came, and from thence be drawen upon a hurdle to the place of execution and there be hanged by the necke and then be cutt downe alive and his entrails and . . . to be cutt off from his bodye and be burned in his sight, his head to be cutt off and his bodie to be divided into fower parts and then to be disposed at the pleasure of parliament."^{*}

On account, it was said, of the respect due to her sex,† which forbade the exposure and mutilation of her body, a woman traitor was not condemned to this lingering death: for her the sentence was to be burnt alive. Three of the Elizabethan martyrs were women, but none of them was condemned for treason: two were hanged for felony, and the third, Ven. Margaret Clitheroe, to the *peine forte et dure* for refusing on account of others to plead to an indictment for the felony‡ of harbouring priests. The sentence was almost as barbarous as that for a male traitor: "You must return from whence you came and there in the lowest part of the prison be stripped naked, laid down, your back upon the ground and as much weight laid on you as you are able to bear, and so continue three days without meat or drink, except a

^{*} *Middlesex County Records*, iii. 199 (*Gaol Delivery Roll 165*). This was during the Commonwealth: normally the ending would be "at the King's pleasure," or words to that effect.

† It is not altogether easy to reconcile this reason with the fact that women, instead of being simply hanged, were also burnt for petty treason, i.e., the murder of husband or employer. There were cases of this as late as the Eighteenth Century.

‡ This punishment was reserved for those who refused to plead when indicted for felony. Those who acted in the same way when indicted for treason were forthwith convicted of treason; and so one who refused to plead to a charge of misdemeanour was convicted of the misdemeanour.

was not designed by the persecutors for the peculiar torture of Catholics: it was the ordinary punishment for high treason when committed by men. And a like savagery was in similar cases perpetrated elsewhere: one has but to recall the terrifying death inflicted in Ravallac for the murder of Henry IV of France, and the "breaking on the wheel" to which traitors were condemned in Portugal till, at any rate, late in the Eighteenth Century. It is easy to agree with Bracton that *Crimen laesae majestatis omnia alia crimina excedit quoad poenam*, and very difficult to reconcile these things with Christianity.

Elizabethan Persecution

little barley bread and puddle water, and the third day be pressed to death, your hands and feet bound to posts and a sharp stone under your back."*

This is not pleasant reading, but only by having these gruesome facts clearly before one's mind can one realize the heroism of those faithful priests who steadily carried on their work, knowing that they might be seized and condemned at any moment, and of those no less faithful laymen who rendered them such help as was in their power. That much coveted distinction, the Victoria Cross, is given for exemplary bravery in the face of the enemy, for acts of heroism outside and beyond the bounds of duty, but never has it been earned by heroism so great as that shown by our martyrs. And to the glory of England it may be said that no other country has such a catalogue of martyred secular priests. Rome itself cannot compete with England in this respect.

EGERTON BECK.

* Burton and Pollen *Lives of English Martyrs*, 2nd Series, i, 195. As a matter of fact, Ven. Margaret Clitheroe died at the end of fifteen minutes and was allowed to wear a long linen garment. (*Ibid.*) For a variant of the terms of the sentence see Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law*, III, 298.

THE HAPPY MARRIAGE

IN his essay on marriage in *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, Mr. Bertrand Russell depicts the present chaos of belief and practice in respect of marriage and the family, the breakdown of old standards, the lack of a controlling principle. The only practical remedy he can propose is an unlimited facility for divorce. But this, he admits, would be no cure for the evil, would not restore the satisfaction once found—normally at least—in lifelong monogamy. "I doubt," he writes, "if there is any radical cure except in some form of religion. . . . As religion dominated the old form of marriage, so religion must dominate the new." He does not, indeed, mean all his words mean. For the only religion he will recognize is "the religion based upon liberty, justice, and love," that is an ethic coloured by emotions logically consistent only with specifically religious experience. But he is groping in the right direction. And where Mr. Russell gropes his way in the night, Patmore saw, if not the rising sun, at least the reddening east where it will rise.

"Love is a recent discovery and requires a new law. Easy divorce is the vulgar solution. The true solution is some undiscovered security for true marriage." This saying, taken from Coventry Patmore's final and least-known book, *Rod, Root, and Flower*, may appear indeed to carry us little further than Mr. Russell, the sole difference being that whereas Mr. Russell advocates easy divorce, Patmore rejects it. But the entire body of Patmore's work makes it clear that "the undiscovered security for true marriage" is not a new creed or institution, but the substance, the spirit of the Christian marriage, hitherto accepted indeed, but in the letter rather than in the spirit, externally admitted, inwardly denied, or altogether ignored. Of course, this would be an exaggerated statement of the facts. Patmore was well aware of the multitudes of men and women who had lived and were living in the spirit as well as in the letter of Christian marriage. But he would, I imagine, have considered that the

Happy Marriage

majority even of these were ignorant of the inexhaustible riches, the unfathomable depth contained and conveyed, but also veiled in marriage, the elusive reality of which it is a sacrament.

The truths of love are like the sea
For clearness and for mystery.

So he begins his *Wedding Sermon*, and of this mystery he believed himself a divinely commissioned prophet and revealer, though able to reveal the secret entrusted to his dispensation only to the chosen few who could read the parables and paradoxes through which he taught it.

But between Patmore's doctrine of the ultimate religion of marriage, a nuptial mysticism too remote and too delicately sacred for the vision of the multitude, and all merely or predominantly physiological views and practices in human sex-relations, between the snow-clad peaks of mystical perception and the low-lying plains abandoned to the marshes and malaria of sensual passion gratified for its own sake, there lies a middle zone, a belt of foothills carpeted with grass, fresh with breezes, fragrant with thyme, uplands where the larks soar singing to heaven, and the bees gather their sweetest honey, the region where sense, indeed, has its delight but in subordination and service to spirit, where the animal man, if not killed, is the bondsman of the spiritual man. In this region Patmore has moved most freely and spoken most clearly, and here is most easily followed. And in this region he built the house for his angel. Certainly there are windows in that house which command a view of the further horizon, of the Alpine summits. Otherwise the crest of the uplands on which the house stands, blocking out all view of the mountains beyond, might be itself mistaken for the mountain top, and thus mistaken, appear a tame and uninteresting eminence. But the house nevertheless is built on the hill slope, not on the mountain peak.

I saw three Cupids (so I dream'd)
Who made three kites, on which were drawn
In letters that like roses gleamed,
"Plato," "Anacreon," and "Vaughan."

Happy Marriage

The boy who held by Plato tried
His airy venture first ; all sail
It heavenward rushed till scarce descried,
Then pitched and dropp'd for want of tail.
Anacreon's love, with shouts of mirth
That pride of spirit thus should fall,
To his kite link'd a lump of earth,
And, lo, it would not soar at all.
Last, my disciple freighted his
With a long streamer made of flowers,
The children of the sod, and this
Rose in the sun, and flew for hours.

Patmore's final standpoint, as expressed in one of the Odes of the *Unknown Eros* cycle, approximates very closely to the Platonic view of love here rejected. Not, indeed, that he accepted the purely spiritual attitude of Platonism with its hostility towards the body. To the end he was a prophet of the "redemption of the body." He always saw the goal of human history as the human body sanctified and spiritual, the temple of God. But he seems, like the Russian philosopher, Solovieff, to contemplate that final spirituality as the ideal form even of earthly marriage. The piety of his second wife was more akin to that of the cloistered nun than to the religion of the Angel in the House. She even criticized passages of her husband's *Wedding Sermon* as falling below the level of the *Imitation*, as if a book of monastic spirituality contained the most suitable doctrine to preach at a marriage. Possibly, she influenced the direction of Patmore's thought. But in his progressive initiation into "the greater and more hidden mysteries of love," Patmore never repudiated Vaughan and his kite with its tail of wild flowers. For he knew that Vaughan's kite can be flown by innumerable men and women who could never handle Plato's.

It would be as impossible as unprofitable to trace even in the most meagre outline the story of successful courtship told in *The Angel in the House*. It must be read as Patmore wrote it. And if any further help is needed the student may be referred to Mr. Osbert Burdett's ex-

Happy Marriage

cellent dissertation, *The Idea of Coventry Patmore*. There he will find the poem followed canto by canto, and its meaning where necessary explained or emphasized.

But, indeed, the poem read carefully is its own sufficient commentary. For the details of the narrative, even the most prosaic, are carefully selected to reveal the character of pure love between man and woman, its beginning, its course, its victory. And to each canto are prefixed two or more shorter poems, the *Preludes*, which treat directly some aspect of love or of womanhood, are contemplations of the idea of nuptial love, and thus serve as a running comment on the narrative, a guide to its meaning. In these *Preludes* there is nothing of the homely detail admitted in the narrative. There are even touches here and there of that external poetry elsewhere so sternly denied.

She wearies with an ill unknown ;
In sleep she sobs and seems to float,
A water-lily, all alone
Within a lonely castle moat.

A pre-Raphaelite picture, and, in fact, Patmore was an intimate friend of the Brotherhood. And in the *Preludes* are the windows that open on the mountains of God.

But here also, though pre-eminently in *The Wedding Sermon** which concludes the entire poem and enforces its teaching, are maxims of exquisite and delicate practical wisdom for the guidance of lover and beloved, of husband and wife. And if married people could be persuaded to a serious attempt at their observance, we should soon witness the Prime Minister's residence besieged by a novel procession of unemployed, a procession headed by Judges in Divorce, and swollen by every species of lawyer that at present grows fat on matrimonial squabbles. These maxims which on one side pass over into sacramental hints of a more solemn mystery, on the other side blend with the everyday bread-and-butter details of the story, bridge the apparent space between these poles of love. And they bridge it in their insistence on the Biblical

* Published separately (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1s.)

Happy Marriage

warnings not to despise small things—to observe not only the laws of marriage but its customs also. For these things, for all their humble seeming, constitute the ritual through which alone the treasure of nuptial love is validly conveyed.

When a stream in flood leaves its bed and spreads over the fields, it loses depth and force and becomes a marsh, stagnant and foul. And its water, soaked up by the earth, never reaches the sea. So, Patmore urges, is it with the passion of love. Let it rush upon the object of its desire, scorning the channel of customary observance.

The fair sum of six thousand years'
Tradition of civility.

It loses its power, its depth, its purity. No longer is it a noble river making the earth fruitful as it flows, but the swamp of sensuality, shallow, poisonous, lifeless.

For, indeed, it is the romantic fallacy, condemned even by Patmore's poetic method, which by persistently misunderstanding marriage has at last come to deny it. Love of its nature rises towards the infinite, as flame ascends. But it is apt to lose the way thither. For it mistakes violation of bounds for boundless freedom. Unrestrained violence of sensual delight, constant novelty of sensible stimulus—a chaos of sensations and excitements, utter abandonment to each in turn—such passion robs marriage of its proper fruit, the inexhaustible satisfaction of love in a progressive union with the beloved, and having robbed it, mocks its victim with a caricature of its stolen treasures. In rebuke of this error Patmore is unwearied. Ever and again he shows that love attains fruition only by self-restraint, because it is only as focused on one point, confined, if you will, to one field, that it becomes definite. And the indefinite is the unsubstantial. And only thus can love penetrate—a work of time and patient endeavour—to the inner self of the beloved, and to its own true self. Only thus in both its ministers can it realize its capacity and fulfil its nature. A thing of beauty is not to be seen by the first glance, however ardent. There is indeed a sudden and intense splendour

Happy Marriage

of radiant loveliness that dazzles and intoxicates, "love's first fine careless rapture," never to be repeated. But that splendour, by its own brilliance, prevents clear vision. A thing of beauty is not only "a joy for ever." "Its loveliness increases." But it will not endure, far less increase, if we attempt to drain the beauty at the first draught. The wine of life's feast must be sipped slowly to enjoy its bouquet. If you try to absorb it in one rapid drink, as a drunkard tosses off his cups, the flavour is never tasted. The unsatisfied palate cries for a new vintage. And this law, universally valid for the perception of beauty, which is a reverent communion with the beautiful, is pre-eminently true of the nuptial communion of love and loveliness. This cannot be effected by the first passion of waking desire, which is crude and blind because still superficial, for the most part mere emotion of the senses. Nor even by the external bond of matrimony. It is a process accomplished progressively but never completed by a progressive mutual penetration of two distinct personalities.

The bliss which woman's charms bespeak
I've sought in many, found in none.
In many 'tis in vain you seek
What can be found in only one.

And this, for the simple reason that the happiness of mutual love is only to be found by the patience and faithful affection which slowly traces the path to that inner chamber where love is at home.

Can ought compared with wedlock be
For use? For he who made the heart
To use proportions joy.

And the disorder that is for ever off with the old love, on with the new, because the old love was not really love at all, incurs the penalty of the wandering Jew.

His sorry pleasures rest destroys,
To live, like comets, they must roam;
On settled poles turn solid joys,
And sun-like pleasures shine at home.

Happy Marriage

But the delimitation of the object of love can only mark out the foundations of "love's fair house." It cannot build it. And if persistence in the exterior bonds raises the walls and roof of the edifice it cannot provide furniture. And an unfurnished, or even an insufficiently furnished, house is not a comfortable dwelling. It drives its inmates to the public-house, or at best to the club. And in marriage it is apt to drive into the divorce court those whose religious principle is not firm enough to enable them to endure the spiritual dreariness and discomfort.

The focus accurately found, observations must be made, the house built, it must be made a home. Marriage—the unending process of union—is thus an art, possessing like all arts not only its delineated province (monogamy), and its inviolable laws (the precepts of sexual morality), but its customs also. These customs can be learnt only by experience, and are capable of indication only, not of definition. But they are none the less valid and indispensable, demanding punctilious observance on penalty, for the disobedient, of failure in the art they regulate. Thus it is with the art of love as with the art of poetry. Success, and with success freedom, is won, not by the licence that tramples on law to do what it likes, but by the knowledge which discovers and obeys and by its obedience uses for its purpose the most subtle and indefinable laws of expression.

They live by laws, not like the fool,
But like the bard, who freely sings
In strictest bonds of rhythm and rule
And finds in them not bonds but wings.

And these rhythms of nuptial love are discerned by the experience of love itself, not as commands of some external authority, but as the forms in which the personality of the lovers unfolds and reveals itself. And they are discovered in a mutual regard for the little things of wedded life, by watchful consideration of "little" feelings, by mutual courtesy even in trifles. For such little things are at once the occasions on which personality

Happy Marriage

utters itself and the means of its utterance. Thus the poet of life, the husband or the wife worthy the name, is, like the poet of letters, a seer.

For marriage is fulfilled in the communion of two persons. And two persons cannot enter into communion unless their personalities are mutually respected. The newly-wedded is apt to believe he possesses his partner. That, Patmore replies, is a vulgar but mortal error. You can never possess a person. To believe you do is at once to violate and to lose the person you imagine yours. Hence the unhappy marriage, the apparent failure of an institution never really tried. You can but approach indefinitely nearer a mutual compenetration. And this by mutual respect and mutual observance.

For observance in the derivative sense involves and is founded upon observance in its literal meaning—the observance that alone discovers the secret treasure of the soul.

Keep your undressed familiar style
For strangers, but respect your wife.

For

Love's perfect blossom only blows
When noble manners veil defect.
Angels may be familiar, those
Who err, each other must respect.

Angels enjoy already perfect union. Man and woman must work it out by the courtesy, which passes beyond the partner's defects, to divine and reverence in him or her, the grace that germinates in the obscure depth of the spirit. For only in the light of this intelligent faith can that grace unfold its blossom.

The husband, therefore, is always a wooer—ever winning his wife's love anew—because winning it at a deeper level of her personality.

Why, having won her, do I woo?
Because her spirit's vestal grace
Provokes me always to pursue
But, spirit-like, eludes embrace.

Happy Marriage

Because, although in act and word
As lowly as a wife can be,
Her manners, when they call me lord,
Remind me 'tis by courtesy.

Because her gay and lofty brows,
When all is won that hope can ask,
Reflect a light of hopeless snows
That bright in virgin ether bask ;
Because though free of the outer court
I am, this temple keeps its shrine
Sacred to Heaven ; because in short
She's not, and never can be, mine.

For the centre of a human soul is a holy ground not to be occupied by a fellow mortal, and personality a fountain whose depth he may never plumb. And this it is that renders every man a distinct person never to be merged into another than himself. Love, therefore, in its hunger for boundless satisfaction, absolute union is always seeking, always finding, never satiated, discovering always something more to know, something more to love.

Oh, spirit of love how fresh and quick thou art
That, notwithstanding thy capacity
Receiveth as the sea, nought enters there
Of what validity or pitch soe'er
But falls into abatement and low price
Even in a moment. So full of shapes is fancy
That it alone is high fantastical.

This is the complaint of a man whose feverish but hollow-hearted passion could not discover love when it was offered, the passion whose fit companion was the fancy whose vision never penetrates beyond the surface, "full of shapes" because empty of substance. Every object it may desire slips in turn from the feeble grasp of this fanciful surface haunting passion, and proves a fiend that

Keeps the word of promise to the ear
And breaks it to our hope.

But the companion of love is not this roving fancy that ever shifts her gaze as the fitful light of a stormy day

Happy Marriage

plays now here, now there, on different points of the landscape and steadily illuminates nothing. It is imagination, whose other name is insight, the light which illuminates every detail of its object. Therefore, when the dazzling gleam of its first rapture has faded, a clear and steady radiance successively reveals in the beloved hidden treasures of beauty, graces hitherto unsuspected. Thus :

Sweet love, which startling wakes
Maiden and Youth . . . mostly breaks
The word of promise to the ear
But keeps it after many a year
To the full spirit.

For here is the flesh not the substitute, but the sacrament of the spirit, and as it decays, its sacramental function accomplished, the spirit is renewed with mightier strength, revealed in more radiant splendour.

And Patmore bears personal witness to his creed. For after the Angel's death—the entire rupture of all fleshly bonds—he writes thus to a newly-married friend :

I, too, am enjoying a honeymoon of memory and hope which it is my prayer that sixteen years' probation may entitle you also to enjoy . . . I am in the same house to which I brought my bride, and for your comfort as a true-hearted young bridegroom I can, without a shadow of exaggeration, say my first nuptial joy was a poor thing compared with the infinite satisfaction I can now feel in the assurance which time has brought that my relation to her is as eternal as it is happy.

The years pass. Patmore breaks a long silence. Again he utters his prophecy of love. But is it the same prophecy ? No longer does love move softly among the trim shadows of the garden laurel, no longer presides over the drawing-room teacups, no longer buys sandshoes, no longer "leaves a gift of wine at Widow Neale's." In a strange place love reappears, wearing a foreign garb, speaking an unknown tongue. His features even are other than they were, transfigured in a light of awful glory. For the poet has left the old house on the hill slope with its reassuring domesticities. He is climbing

Happy Marriage

those mountain peaks amid the glaciers and the ravines, a terrible form outlined against the horizon, his face towards the dawn. He invites us, no longer to take out the brougham and pay an afternoon call on himself and the Angel, but to climb the steep mountain paths, dangerous and barren, to behold enthroned on the giddy summit the veiled figure of the Unknown Eros. No wonder his readers were dismayed, and failed to understand the transfiguration. No wonder if his contemporaries who had seen in the Angel merely a drawing-room romance of tame felicity cried in utter perplexity: "Come down from yonder mountain height, cease to move so near the heavens. Love cares not to walk with Death and Morn-ing on the silver horns; love is of the valley; come thou down and find him; by the happy threshold he. Indeed, did you not yourself teach us to find him there? We came at your call. And you bid us climb aloft to the mountains where dwell only those hermits and mystics, grotesque, mediæval, popish, who in pursuit of a sick dream despised the domestic hearth and its Angel. We had never thought to see Honoria's woer a hermit of the wilderness." So they drew back, and left the prophet to consign copies of his *Unknown Eros* to the flames in despair of an audience.* Nor did Patmore condescend to conciliate or to explain. After the fashion of prophets whose wisdom is rejected, he hurls scoffs at the "acorn munchers" and "forest pigs" who could not receive his hard sayings.

Bitter, sweet, few and veiled let be
Your songs of me;
Preserving bitter very sweet,
Few, that so all may be discreet
And veiled, that, seeing, none may see.

Thus the *Unknown Eros* to the prophet:

Be dumb,
Or speak but of forgotten things to far-off times to come.

He obeyed. In the verse of the *Odes*, and the prose aphorisms of *Rod, Root and Flower*, he uttered his oracles

* Happily reprinted later in an enlarged edition.

Happy Marriage

in "a language dead," regardless whether any could unriddle them. For the mysteries of love must be wrapped in riddles and parables to be understood only by the few who are capable of understanding. Such was the teaching of Love Incarnate. "Without a parable spoke He nothing unto them." To you, "the initiates of divine truth, is it given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but to those without in parables, that hearing they might not understand." And the proof of incapacity? Patmore's audience had never understood what they had seemed to understand. They had missed the lesson of *The Angel in the House*. They had paid their visit and gone home full of praise for the house and its Chatelaine. But they had seen nothing that the poet had tried to show them. "The crumpets delicious! Honoria's teagown charming. I must tell my dressmaker about it. Her manner: There never was a hostess who knew better how to dispense the honours of a country house. What a wise match Mr. Vaughan has made. Mrs. Vaughan suits the place to perfection. The children so well behaved, the servants so cleverly managed, the garden a dream." But marriage, a vehicle, and therefore a reflection and a symbol of God's spousal love for the soul—of course no one could have suspected anything so absurd, so indelicate. To be sure, on occasion Mr. Vaughan was heard to make a few queer remarks, that savoured too much of Sunday and the Church service to be quite reverent on a weekday and in the drawing-room:

Lo there whence love, life, light are poured
Veiled with impenetrable rays
Amidst the presence of the Lord
Co-equal Widsom laughs and plays.
Female and male God made the man,
His image is the whole, not half,
And in our Love we dimly scan
The Love that is between Himself.

"But after all, my dear, he *is* a poet. And how does a poet differ from the ordinary prose speaking mortal unless by sharing the parson's privilege of fine language which not

Happy Marriage

even the speaker is supposed to take seriously ? ” And if we were a little perplexed by these incongruous interruptions, we were set at ease when the poet proceeded to chatter the local news.

The Major Domo Mrs. Rouse,
A dear old soul from Wilton House,
Will scold the housemaids and the cook.

Completely reassuring, plenty of sound common sense in Mr. Vaughan. But now !

Who is this only happy She
Whom by a frantic flight of courtesy
Born of despair
Of better lodging for his spirit fair
He adores as Margaret, Maud or Cecily,
And what this sigh
That each one heaves for Earth's last lowlihead
And the heavens high
Ineffably locked in earthy bridal bed ?
Are all then mad, or is it prophecy ?
“ Sons now we are of God,” as we have heard,
But what we shall be hath not yet appeared.
Oh Heart remember thee
That Man is none
Save One.
What if this lady be thy Soul, and He
Who claims to enjoy her sacred beauty be
Not thou, but God.

He did mean it all the time. The house and its Angel that seemed such comfortably solid realities fade before our eyes to transparent veils of transcendent spirituality. Marriage is not the temple of Love, merely its forecourt, the court of the Gentiles. The shrine is consecrated Virginity, those lonely and bare cells where nuns, “ the Brides of Christ lie hid emparadised.” There, not in the domestic comfort of High Hurst Park love's festival is kept “ crowned with roses.” Not to the gay accompaniment of the Wedding March or amid the laughter of “ the Loves ” struggling with their hedgehog, which “ though the best in this kind are but shadows,” is heard

Happy Marriage

clear and full "the inexpressive nuptial song." Listen for it rather in the chant of conventual choirs :

Oh hear
Them singing clear
Cor Meum et Caro mea around the I am,
The Husband of the heavens.

And in the homeliest details, for Patmore never shrinks from realism, never allows us to mistake dreamland for paradise, the never-never land for the new Jerusalem, the poet relates the courtship between God and the Soul in a pagan myth, shockingly profane, dubiously moral, the tale of Cupid and Psyche. No novel doctrine certainly, the venerable love story of the Mystics, the wisdom of the Saints. But the orthodoxy of the Saints is the heresy of the Nineteenth Century public.

What's a Saint to them
Brought up in modern virtues Brummagem ?
With garments grimed and lamps gone all to snuff
And counting others for like Virgins queer,
To list those others cry, "our Bridegroom's near,"
Meaning their God is surely quite enough
To make them rend their clothes and bawl out
"Blasphemy."

Therefore, Patmore fell foul of both his possible audiences. Those who expect from poetry the magic key of Wonderland were repelled by their introduction to Sarum Close. Those who were delighted to visit in the Close indignantly refused to follow Patmore to the Cloister. The prophet found himself addressing empty space.

But the Nineteenth Century is dead. And its passing has left the issues clearer. Either human sex-love is an animal passion, the flower of natural life whose end is the enjoyment and subordinately the propagation of natural life ; or it is, potentially, at least, the reflection and sacrament of a spiritual and supernatural love-life that weds immortal souls with their divine Creator and Lover. Naturalism maintains the former, Catholic Christianity the latter alternative. The modern secularist, pursuing

Happy Marriage

the logic of naturalism, treats the problem of sexual relations frankly as the regulation of an animal instinct to provide the maximum of pleasure for the individual without prejudice to health or the equal right of others. Hence the birth-control propaganda, brutal and indiscriminate sex instruction, easy divorce, even, with the boldest and most consistent, concessions to free love. For this is the logic of naturalism.

On the other hand, Catholic Christianity, precisely because it views the union of the sexes as the sacrament of a supernatural union between God and the soul, demands its sublimation and control to be a vehicle and instrument of the latter. Hence indissoluble and sacramental marriage. And it prefers and must prefer, even to the sacrament of matrimony, not indeed, mere natural celibacy, but religious virginity, in which the expression of the natural life instinct, the physical union, is transcended as a limitation of the spiritual union with God. And beyond even this the lives of the Saints bear out the teaching of Patmore and Solovieff that in this union with God there may exist a higher, a purely spiritual, union between man and woman, "a marriage of true minds" in God. And nowhere on the ladder of spiritual ascent—this is Patmore's particular insistence—is the body rejected. It is progressively sanctified, spiritualized as a vessel of the supernatural love-life, in which the merely natural is absorbed. With this, the supernatural and the spiritual principle of human love logically worked out, the Catholic Church opposes the logic of the alternative principle, the natural, the animal.

The Victorians dared not face the problem at all. A survival of Christian feeling made them uphold, in the main—for after all the first divorce act was their work—the institution of monogamy, and moreover made them clothe sex-love with a garb of quasi-religious sentiment to hide from their eyes its animal nakedness. Thus for Tennyson the Arthurian legend becomes a morality of the respectable family, a sermon against adultery. Because Patmore was the prophet and singer of wedlock, the Victorians

Happy Marriage

imagined him the Laureate of their sentimental proprieties. To be sure, Patmore does not undervalue propriety, the decencies, indeed, the courtesies of life. But for him they are the comely order of a sacramental rite whose every word and gesture is a symbol, not the barren formalities of a Buckingham Palace levee. And his Victorian public failed to grasp the distinction. But since the Victorians refused to see the essential animality of sex as a natural phenomenon they could not see the necessity of its subordination to the supernatural love-life of the Spirit. Content with excluding, from the public view, at least, the grosser and more lawless forms of sex, they canonized its regulated use as a thing finally and absolutely good, as itself spiritual love and the adequate love of an immortal spirit. Hence it neither could nor should be transcended and absorbed by a virginal love higher and fuller. Don Juan shocked the Victorians, St. Bernard annoyed them. For ears polite the house of ill-fame did not exist. And the Convent ought not to exist.

The clouds of this wilful confusion hid the figure of Patmore. His contemporaries loved him by mistake; the mistake removed, they neglected him. But to-day these clouds are being dispersed. The alternatives are coming into ever clearer view. We must make the choice. Either life, and therefore love, is mortal and earthly. Then must we follow the Neo-pagans, advocate easy divorce, support the propaganda of Miss Marie Stopes. Or for man natural life and love are a possible sacrament of a supernatural love-life, that must utilize, sublimate, absorb the merely natural and animal. If this latter creed be our choice, let us go to school with Patmore. He will show us the logic of our decision.

For he will show us, first, Christian marriage, still for the majority of mankind the necessary instrument of divine love. But thence he will lead us higher, in practice or in theory according to our individual call, though here or hereafter theory must be embodied in practice. He will guide us upward to that mountain crest where natural life and the love which is its blossom wholly yields to the

Happy Marriage

invasion of the divine life in which it is grounded, supported, justified, where Virginity is the fullness of wedlock, where the husband of the woman is the Bride of God, where the body is transfigured with the light of Spirit, where God is clad with the flesh He has taken, where marriage and Incarnation are one. There Patmore, foolishly imagined the Poet of the Victorian tea table, is seen as he is, the Apocalyptic angel who bids us "Come, I will show thee the spouse of the Lamb. And he led me in spirit to a great and lofty mountain and showed me the Holy City Jerusalem descending from God adorned as a Bride for her husband."

E. I. WATKIN.

LATIN RENDERINGS OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

ST. PHILIP NERI.

"This is the Saint of gentleness and kindness."

Ecce qui blanda pietate Sanctus
Flectit immites hilaratque flexos,
Criminum pompa specieque captis
Dulce levamen.

Dum vocat mundus magicasque fallax
Venditat gazas, melioris Urbis
Noster hic lucrum memorat, fideque
Nos capit aucta.

Vinculo nullo nisi amore fretus,
Parte contentus tenui tributa,
Per bonum nos ad meliora ducit,
Ut damus ansam.

Fervor orandi, recreante Nostro,
Talis, ut punctum videantur horae,
Talis et risu pudor est repletis,
Ut scelus absit.

Per vias rectas ita perque amoenas
Ducit intactos scelere et solutos,
Luce dum clara superi fruamur
Regis in aula.

THE MISSION OF ST. PHILIP.

"On northern coasts our lot is cast."

Rari Borea nos fidem
In insula servamus,
Sed gens Philippi sub Petro
Conscripta militamus.

Latin Renderings of Newman

Salve, Parens et Conditor,
Romae juventae florem
Petri sub umbra qui dicas,
Totumque das laborem.

Apostolum te suscipit
Romae suae cunctarum
Petri sub ampla porticu
Apostolus terrarum.

Sub Urbe longi qua specus
Altique delitescunt,
Papae tuebantur gregem,
Nunc martyres quiescunt.

Pernox ibi dum junior
Divina deprecatur,
En ignifer Paraclitus
Intrare cor dignatur.

Impulsus Urbis in vias
Amoris hoc afflatu,
Claram juventutem vocat
Babelis a paratu.

Quos cogit intra nidulum
Visoque paenitentes
Splendore cordis intimi
Suos facit clientes.

Defunctus, unica domo
Qui vivus haud prodivit,
Romas subacturus novas
Jam mobilis quaesivit.

Ducta via nunc longius
Per gurgitem furentem,
Ipsum cor huius insulae
Spectamus amplectentem.

Sit laus Deo, qui tam pium,
Tam candidum creavit,
Ductoque Petri de sinu
Nos supplices mandavit.

Latin Renderings of Newman

THE REGULARS AND ST. PHILIP.

"The holy monks concealed from men."

Clam nocte monachos in choro,
In cella agrove interdiu,
Caeli per aestum per gelu
Voti tenaces diligo.

Fratres nec emerent minus,
Servi duorum Principum,
Iram domantes hostium,
Vel alligantes vulnera.

Instructa Sancto Nomine
Jesu sodalium cohors,
Bellum gerens cum daemone,
Exsultat in certamine.

Sed praeter istos quem colo,
Quacunque claros regula,
Est suavis aspectu senex,
Quem laudo amoque impensius.

Laudo capillum candidum,
Lumen micans, os vividum,
Verbum loquentis igneum,
Ni raptus in Deo silet.

Raro fragrantés balsamo
Tendit manus et integro,
Nostram nec horret Angliam,
Qua corda frigent cum polo.

Nos grátiosus visitat,
Frontemque blandus explicat,
Miti loquela si queat
Mollire dignos vindice.

Philippe, Sancte amabilis,
Pater faveto filiis,
Fac te secutos in via
Coram videre in patria.

SEBASTIAN RITCHIE.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

IN *Shakespeare and the Universities* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford; pp. vii.+270) Mr. F. S. Boas has given us, as usual in his works, an immense deal of curious and carefully compiled information. It is interesting to learn that we must not conclude from the title pages of the Quarto *Hamlet* of 1603, which claims that the play is set forth "as it hath been diverse times acted . . . in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford," that this took place with the permission of the University authorities. On the contrary, we find that the Vice-Chancellors of those days were completely in accord with their present successor at Oxford in holding that such things were a disturbing element in academic life, and that they took the simple but expensive course of paying travelling companies to go away. If Shakespeare was able "to play the Ghost in his own *Hamlet*" at Oxford at all, it was in defiance of the University authorities. We find such entries as these in the Vice-Chancellor's accounts at that period:

1587-8.—Paid to the actors of the Earl of Leicester to depart with their plays without further troubling the University . . . xx shillings.

Almost every year there are similar entries. In 1588 a company was paid *ne ludos inhonestos exercerent infra Vniversitatem*. In 1590 actors were paid to depart *sine perturbatione et strepitu*. And by the Statute of 1584 "if any Master, Bachelor or Scholar above the age of eighteen ventured to attend any such performance he did so at the risk of imprisonment, while younger students were liable to 'open punishment' in St. Mary's Church."

There is also a fascinating story of a performance of *Hamlet* on board an English ship, the *Dragon*, in 1607, near Sierra Leone. The performance was in honour of one Lucas Fernandez, a negro, who was "brother-in-law to King Borea," and was given "a very kynde interteynment aborde" by Captain Keeling. Lucas was "a Xian and could argue well of his ffaith, only he was ledd by the delusions of the ffryers accordinge to the popishe

Some Recent Books

religion." "Has there ever been," Mr. Boas asks, "a stranger episode in stage-history than this shipboard performance of *Hamlet*, 'breaking the silence of the seas' near Sierra Leone, in honour of Keeling's dusky guest?"

A. S. B.

MR. R. CROMPTON RHODES' book on *Shakespeare's First Folio, a Tercentenary Study* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell; pp. 147) is equally full of minute learning, but does not impress one with quite the same confidence as does the work of Mr. Boas. It is an ingenious explanation in the strictly orthodox sense of all the difficult problems connected with the First Folio, but it gives one the impression sometimes of making a case in accordance with preconceived ideas, rather than of an absolutely impartial study of the evidence with a view to finding out exactly where the truth lies. Mr. Rhodes is quite sure that Shakespeare "wrote straight ahead with a flowing pen, and when he had written a passage, he did not alter it." The comment of R. L. Stevenson that "this statement simply proves that his Editors were unacquainted with the common enough phenomenon called fair copy" is summarily dismissed as "pert." He is quite clear, too, that the Preface is the actual work of "the pious fellows," and that neither Ben Jonson nor anyone else had any hand in it. Every statement, in fact, is taken as being simply true as it stands, no matter how much difficulty it presents, and the argument is built up accordingly. The principle has at least the merit of being simple. But it is rather disturbing to find it laid down as being "without doubt" that Chettle was referring to Shakespeare in his famous apology in the preface to *Kind Heart's Dream*. To some of us, at any rate, it seems that such a reference is expressly excluded by the passage for which he is apologizing. For it was one or two of those play-makers to whom Greene's original letter was addressed who had taken offence and for whom the apology was meant. And Shakespeare was not one of the three addressed, but was incidentally attacked in the course of

Effects of the Reformation

the letter. The book, however, even if a little one-sided, contains a great deal of valuable information carefully and clearly put together.

A. S. B.

DR. GEORGE O'BRIEN'S *Essay on the Economic Effects of the Reformation* (Burns, Oates and Washbourne) will enhance his reputation as a sure and learned Catholic economist. Between the extravagant evils of Capitalism and Socialism (both of which he traces to the Reformation) he hails the golden mean of mediæval ethics. "The Church had as little sympathy with the fanatics who wished to ignore this world in order to fix their eyes exclusively on the next, as it had with those avaricious and worldly people who ignored the next world in order to fix their eyes exclusively on this." Luther denounced usury, but unlike St. Thomas could not draw distinction between "justifiable interest and unjustifiable usury." The Reformation was the dividing line between an organic and a critical period, but the critical has threatened to destroy what remains of an organic Europe. The Reformation was a violent revolt of individualism tending towards Bolshevism of thought, but in England it took form as the Great Slump, when the nation, wearied and decimated by civil wars and worried by new thought, was unable to meet the Renaissance from the Catholic plane and sagged into the second-rate and compromise. In the English Church a sham prelacy and a Bowdlerized Mass were symbolic of the moral exhaustion rather than reform that the nation suffered under Tudorism. But in every walk of life or art there were signs that a great tradition had been snapped. The degeneration that set into heraldry and brass tomb-slabs was a minor item, but the debasement of currency was not. Architecture failed singularly. Literature enjoyed a miraculous recovery, thanks to the Janus Shakespeare, who carried the old Catholic tradition into the new era. In economics the English people exchanged the monastery for the poor-house, the village cross for the stocks, and hierarchy for the squirarchy. Eventually the Reforma-

Some Recent Books

tion bred Socialism out of the dead Guilds. Dr. O'Brien associates Capitalism with Judaism and Socialism with development of Lutheranism, and his thesis will not be easily upset. The Anglican oligarchy, who ruled England for three hundred years, he seems to overlook as a compromise, but its bewildered agony in these days is none the less a part of the great movement he has set himself to study. S. L.

THE possibility of *Shakespeare's Hand* (Camb. Univ. Press) surviving in the *Play of Sir Thomas More* (Harl. 7368) was first pointed out by Richard Simpson, editor of the *Rambler*, and is strikingly strengthened by the commentators in this fascinating book. To Catholics there is no more interesting play, for it is the apotheosis of the martyred Chancellor. It is unique, as it survives in a number of different hands, one of which may be actually that of Shakespeare, called in to save, with one superb scene, the wreck made by the censor. The censor's notes show objection to any reference to civil broils, such as the line, "But if the English blood be once but up." The Rising in the North still flavoured statesmen's fears. As Sheriff, More quells a riot of the Britons against the alien Lombards, "outlandish fugitives" of the day. The play covers a protest against the privileged entry of foreign sectaries, especially Huguenots, for the censor has changed "[Frenchman]" into Lombard. But the obvious reason the play could not be performed under Elizabeth was that it challenged the Royal Supremacy, in the characters of More and Fisher, both of whom had been executed by the parent of the reigning sovereign. The play gives them noble words:

More: "Subscribe these articles! Stay, let us pause;
Our conscience first shall parley with our laws."

Fisher: "My heart will check my hand, whilst I do write,
Subscribing so I were an hypocrite."

These make proud words for Catholic quotation. Mr. Pollard says that "the contents of the articles are carefully left unexplained. Elizabeth retained the ecclesi-

Sir Thomas More

astical supremacy, which More died rather than approve." The censor's instructions to delete the lines referring to Fisher's removal to the Tower have been explained by Mr. Fleay as a dangerous allusion to Lord Hertford, but Mr. Pollard remarks, "Fisher was sent to the Tower for denying the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, and as Elizabeth claimed and exercised this supremacy, the censor's alarm needs no other explanation." Fisher's soul

aims at higher things

Than temporary pleasing earthly kings.

More's proud defiance is in sequel,

Then living thus untainted you are well,

Truth is no pilot for the land of Hell.

The words of the play set the seal on their martyrdom, which would have wakened singularly poignant echoes in an Elizabethan audience. Throughout the play More affords the delicious comic relief to his own tragedy until he comes in sight of that "most sweete gallery," with the famous scaffold jest that rings down English history. Here is a play for Catholic players to essay! especially what Dr. Brooke calls "More's magnificent speech in defence of order and humanity," all in the Shakespearean technique and touch. Of all the *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, admirably edited by Dr. Tucker Brooke (Ox. Univ. Press), *Sir Thomas More* and, thanks to Swinburne's advocacy, *Arden of Feversham*, show the genuine touch but fail of the dramatic unity. The latter has the theme of the curse attaching to stolen abbey lands woven into its web from the opening to the end. Dispute and sudden death dog the possessors, as Spelman's *History of Sacrilege* delighted to bring out. It is in the more Protestant play of *Cromwell* (which with *Sir John Oldcastle* has been attributed wrongly to Shakespeare) that Bishop Gardiner makes his fine protest on behalf of the "lazy abbots and full-fed friars."

When, God doth know the infant yet unborn
Will curse the time the Abbies were pulled down,
I pray now where is hospitality? etc.

Some Recent Books

It is pleasant to be able to associate Shakespeare with a lingering regret and real knowledge of the old Faith. Mr. Pollard has been assisted by Mr. W. Greg and Mr. Dover Wilson, who adds some brilliant evidence to show that both Shakespeare and the writer in *Sir Thomas More* were old-fashioned spellers. Finally, Mr. Chambers brings out the stylistic and political parallel almost beyond controversy. Shakespeare wrote this scene, or if not, the less Shakespeare he! Seldom has a stronger or more scholarly combination worked to elaborate a single Shakespearean question with more overwhelming result. But the most curious result will lie in their tacit answer to those who assert that Shakespeare, being illiterate, left no body of handwriting behind. As readers may deduce from the appearance of Mgr. Barnes' article in the present DUBLIN REVIEW, the Baconian Heresy has not been condemned by the Holy Church!

S. L.

IRELAND is so often predicated lawless, that Miss Sophie Bryant's study of the primitive *Liberty, Order and Law under Native Irish Rule* (Harding and More) adds an interesting corrective. Produced on fine paper and in noble print, it is the type of volume we had hoped see issue from the presses of the emancipated Gael. We may safely say that its content confers a far greater glamour on Ireland than Proportional Representation or any experiment in modern politics. "The Senchus of the Men of Erin, what has preserved it? The tradition from one ear to another, the addition of the law of the letter, strength from the law of nature, for these are the three rocks on which the judgments of the world are supported." The Brehon Law of Ireland is perhaps the most unique contribution Ireland has to offer out of the Gaelic past. Other nations have saved their Aryan Saga, but the great bulk of Aryan Law (unromanized except for the Patrician revision) which has been revealed by the Commissioners for publishing the Ancient Laws of Ireland, calls for the serious attention of those who are elected legislators of the Gael.

Law under Native Irish Rule

The recognized stumbling-block in Brehon Law was the eric fine for murder, which varied subtly according to the class of the victim and the intention of the slayer. This was an improvement on blood vengeance, or reprisal in kind, but with the development of Capital a social impossibility. The Brehon Law made no distinction between public crime and personal torts. The family of a murdered man received heavy damages, which was, no doubt, often as considerable a deterrent as the gallows. The family were responsible for the crimes of a member, a host was responsible for his guest's behaviour and a foster-father shared with the natural father any damages caused by the foster-son. The missionaries did not Romanize in the sense of standardizing the national code, but rather allowed the Church to be Celticized, which accounts for the anomalies and peculiarities of the Irish Church, sometimes mistaken for a species of pure archaic Protestantism before its day.

The modern Church and State are not likely to revert to Celtic custom, but it may be pointed out that the system of fosterage and the law of sick maintenance has something to teach Educational and Hospital Commissioners to-day. The rights of the Celtic Church seem excessive, for the eldest son was included in the tithes with other firstlings! The Church obtained certain rights in the cleric she educated, but was bound to support him. The Church was not national but tribal. The phrase, "tribe of the saint," meant either the community of monks attached to a lay tribe or that tribe out of which the saint had come and in which the succession lay. It appears that different churches had the same dealings with students that is practised sometimes by modern dioceses. A student "is forfeited by his own church to the church that has educated him until his original church pay the price of his education." Latin Christianity without Latin organization was the key of the Irish Church, but this did not prevent her being spiritually Roman. The adaptation of Catholicism into the self-governing tribes of Ireland was performed without destroying the essential

Some Recent Books

creed of one or the native code of the other. This work of genius is reflected in the Brehon *Law*. We have dwelt on a few aspects, but we commend Miss Bryant's satisfying survey to all who are interested in the past or future of Ireland. The publishers have laid Gaeldom under a great debt.

S. L.

MISS SHEILA KAYE-SMITH has an alert eye and mind and memory, great gifts these, but whether her heart is equally observant and responsive may not be known. In matters of religion, for example, the lady of *The Tramping Methodist* has gone far before she reached *The End of the House of Allard* (Cassell), the end that is the nearest approach to a monk's cell that Anglicanism can provide. We do not think her own conscience is quite in it. It is easy enough to write of the Anglican service as "Mass," and of the rector as "Father"; but when we hear that a church-decorator hangs a daisy-chain round the neck of the Mother of God, we lack in that phraseology the sensitiveness of the true and versed user of images—we seem hardly this side of idolatry. And yet the seeming inference that religion should be left out of books of realistic fiction, except just so far as the author's own religious experience carries her, is delusive. In story after story now published we find religion as an influence on life ignored. And in that respect, so far as our own experience goes, Life and Literature have ceased to tally.

That Miss Kaye-Smith does know a great deal that is not common knowledge about Catholic ideals we at once admit, even if her statement of it jars:

Catholic Christianity stands fast because it belongs to an order of things which doesn't change. It's made of the same stuff as our hearts. It's the supernatural satisfaction of all our natural instincts. Its sacraments are all common things—food, drink, marriage, birth and death. Its highest act of worship is a meal; its most sacred figures are a dying man and a mother nursing her child. . . . Aren't they part of the same thing—love of man and love of God? Yes, they are; but to-day there is a schism in the body.

Mussolini

If Miss Kaye-Smith had felt a full measure of sympathy with the theme of her book, the passing of the Squires, she would not have put forth as an example of the class a half-lunatic bully. Rather Chesterton struck a truer as well as more romantic note when he said that "the last sad squires ride slowly towards the sea." Sir John Allard is a man who, whatever his class, must pass. Against that pride in land-possession which condemned his children to poverty we have the vehement protest of his daughter Jenny:

Oh, these big country-houses make one sick. We're all cut to a pattern. There's always the beautifully kept grounds and the huge mortgaged estate that's tumbling to pieces for want of money to spend on it. Then, when you go in, there are hot-house flowers everywhere, and beautiful glass and silver—and bad cooking. And we're waited on badly because we're too old-fashioned and dignified to employ women, so we have the cheapest butler we can get, helped by a footman taken from the plough. We always have two cars though we can't afford motor-traction for our land. We're falling to pieces, but we hide the cracks with pots of flowers. Why can't we sell our places? We could afford to be happy then.

So Jenny marries a neighbouring farmer; and, to complete the picture of a break-up, her elder brother shoots himself. We are not quite sure whether the author knows all the difference there is in these two methods of taking one's life into one's own hands! That suspicion arises from the want of heart which we seem to detect in great things and small in a woman whose head is indeed shoulders above that of almost any other living writer of fiction.

W. M.

FASCISM is a vivid thing; Mussolini has a vivid personality; and Miss Godden's *Mussolini: the Birth of the New Democracy* (Burns, Oates and Washbourne), is a vivid book. Her theme, in fact, necessitated it. What she tells us is more than just the story of how Fascism came along to clear up the chaotic political and social conditions in Italy, to take the country by the scruff

Some Recent Books

of its neck and drag it out of the slough of despond in which it was allowing itself to be engulfed. "The culminating triumph of October, 1922, in Rome," she tells us, "may prove to be the foundation stone of a new Europe" (p. 1); "Fascism is the first national movement to sweep aside with overwhelming force those subversive principles which have threatened Western civilization ever since the closing years of the Eighteenth Century" (p. 116). So one is not surprised to find over twenty pages of description of the results of Communism in Russia; one is not surprised at the high colour thrown on the evil, and on the picture of conditions in Italy before Fascism came to effect the remedy, the story of how Mussolini, "not a man but a flame," burned out the evil in the fire of patriotism he enkindled in what Miss Godden calls the New Democracy, but which it would be more true to call Young Italy. Enflamed with the greatness of a theme, a writer will throw flame into the colouring of the picture drawn; moreover, nowadays attention is not caught by subdued, studied lights. That Russia was breeding danger to Europe; that things in Italy at the end of 1919 and the beginning of 1920 were temporarily in a very bad way; that Mussolini and his Fascisti have done a wonderfully big thing and the Prime Minister has shown himself a really big man; that it is good that the world should see what has been done in Italy and what can be done, if need arises, in ways adapted to different conditions, elsewhere too—these things are facts making for fruitful reading of Miss Godden's book. But, one may ask, need vivid light necessarily impair accuracy and truth? Reading, one blinks sometimes. There are little points: In "Santa Maria degli Angli" Miss Godden has inaccurately reversed Gregory the Great, nor is the church alluded to "attached to the Royal palace," nor in actual fact did the King go down after Mass with the Ministers to the grave of the Unknown Soldier, he went privately earlier in the morning. Nor is Santa Marinella a port. Nor, though it may on a date named have subsided out of action under *force majeure*, has the Italian

Mussolini

Communist Party, small as it is and always has been, ceased to exist. Nor is there a "Catholic Party" in Italy. Nor was the San Lorenzo quarter quite as patriotic as depicted; on the Sunday mentioned, October 29th, the incoming Fascisti had a fight there. Nor is Signor Maffi a Communist; he is a Socialist extremist certainly. Nor was the deficit on the railways "in the Budget of 1922" two and a half milliards; in the Budget of 1921-2 it was just over a milliard and a quarter, far nearer the figure mentioned on a previous page.

These are little inaccuracies; the greater lies in the picture drawn of Italy before Fascism fought its way to control. A writer in Rome takes the liberty of saying that the statement made on p. 14 of this London book, even if reinforced by the fact of being a quotation from a publication in America, that "By the end of 1919 revolution had actually broken out in Italy," is absolutely untrue. That is not to underestimate the dangerous aspect of what was going on, and it is perfectly true that many special correspondents came here at that time to report the "revolution"—but they went away without doing so. There was no revolution, and those on the spot knew that there would be none. The nearest approach to any such thing was in the days of the temporary madness of the "occupation of the factories," and it is significant that that mad movement was killed by the good sense of the operatives themselves, expressed through the General Confederation of Labour, which to the outsider might have appeared "revolutionary" itself. To talk so freely of "revolution," of "Italy brought within measurable distance of national dissolution," of "religion derided," of "Communist bureaucracy," of "Communism capturing the ballot," of "Communism in Parliamentary control" (there were no Communists in the 1919 Parliament, though many of the 156 Socialists were temporarily "Maximalistically" mad, and in 1921 only fourteen declared Communists found their way to the Chamber)—all this is inexact. Exaggerated high lights thrown on the personality and policy of the Prime Minister by more

Some Recent Books

than one unacclimatized, impressionable and headline-suggesting writer, give a picture of conditions here which is regrettable at a moment when a truer mutual understanding of conditions in the two countries could go far, not only towards avoiding friction, but towards stabilizing Europe.

L. J. S. W.

IT is no doubt a platitude, but one that is not altogether futile, that the value of a translator's work will depend on two things: on his measure of success in giving fresh insight into the original, and on the worth of that original itself.

Of the essential value of classical Italian literature there can be no two opinions. And Jowett's words to John Addington Symonds: "I think that you are happy in having unlocked so much of Italian literature, certainly the greatest in the world after Greek, Latin, English," might perhaps be considered to call for qualification, but hardly for entire restatement. But what is perhaps not so universally recognized is the high classical quality and rich variety alike that characterize the literature of the new Italy, of the Italy that was reborn with the first glimmerings of the Risorgimento spirit. It is true that that literature has been somewhat overcharged with ephemeral politics, but there is also an astonishing amount in it that is of permanent worth.

It is in that field that Professor Bickersteth is doing really invaluable work. His translations of Carducci are noteworthy, while his analysis, in the introduction to the same, of the marvellous method by which the poet solved the metrical problem of the "Odi Barbare" is hardly to be equalled even in the vast Carduccian bibliography that has arisen in Italy itself. He has now turned from the poet of the Risorgimento movement to the greatest literary figure of the unhappy Italy that immediately preceded it. It is fortunate that *The Poems of Leopardi* (Camb. Univ. Press) have fallen into the hands of so sympathetic an English editor. Things might have been otherwise, since scholars, even as poets, are swayed by temperament.

The Poems of Leopardi

Yet no man needs more careful treatment than Leopardi, and Professor Bickersteth has shown himself entirely adequate to the task.

Yet, if it is not ungrateful to the translator to say so, the most valuable part, both of the Carducci book and of the present one on Leopardi, is the interpretative introduction. It renders a great act of justice to Leopardi, of whom the average English reader probably derives his estimate from the summary account given in Richard Garnett's *Italian Literature*. Excellent as that manual is in general, it hardly deals fairly with Leopardi the "pessimist," with Leopardi the thinker. Professor Bickersteth, more patient and more fully informed, at last makes ample amends. No doubt, with his whims and *idées fixes*, Leopardi is at times most aggravating. Joy is *not* extinct, nor did the youth of the world end with the battle of Philippi; or whence the ecstatic joy of d'Annunzio's poetry, or the youthful full-blooded strength of our own Masfield? Still the very craziness of much of Leopardi's outlook have given him a power of analysis and an originality of standpoint which give him full claims to be numbered among the philosophers. "If he was a great philosopher," says Garnett, "so must Voltaire and Lucian be esteemed." The comparison is hardly a fair one: and, even so, Voltaire has been acknowledged a philosopher by Kant.

The translations themselves, with the careful preservation of even the medial rhymes in almost every case, are an achievement, though naturally not without faults and imperfections of detail. The phrase "well-watered" might perhaps mean "watered by wells"; but, context apart, that is not the meaning that most naturally suggests itself. Professor Bickersteth does not, as far as I know, use that particular phrase; but he does speak of a fleet hand

winging

Its flight across the *hardly-woven web*.

The "hardly-woven web" is much more equivocal than

Some Recent Books

the Italian *la faticosa tela*. (*A Silvia*, XXI, 22.)
Again, the simple Italian :

Ch' abbella agli occhi tuoi quest' ermo lido. (IV, 4.)
becomes

. . . which of this desert shore doth make
An Eden in thy sight.

which, though typically English in expression, is unfortunate, not only as being figurative where Leopardi is direct, but also as importing a scriptural image into a poem thoroughly classical in subject and treatment. Leopardi would never have used such an expression in the context even had the image occurred to his mind.

Nor, lastly, does one quite like the hackneyed translation "wretch" for *misera*, applied to a hope that has failed.

All' apparir del vero
Tu, misera, cadesti. (XXI, 61, 62.)

The whole colour and tone of the Italian (and Latin) *misera* are different from those of the English "wretch": just as "misery" and "miserable" are dangerous equivalents of the French *misère* and *miserable*.

These, however, are small points in the general excellence of the renderings which often echo most skilfully the cadence of the original.

That the Latinisms of the three patriotic odes (*All' Italia*, *Sopra Il Monumento di Dante*, *Ad Angelo Mai*) have not been reproduced is almost inevitable. While the lingering haunting effect of the typical Italian line, due to the multiplicity of the feminine endings, can hardly be tried with safety in English on any extensive scale. Yet, perhaps, the translator has been a little shy of the attempt. How much more effective, for instance, it would have been to render *canto* not by "song" but by "singing," in

Sonavan le quiete
Stanze, e le vie dintorno,
Al tuo perpetuo canto.

East Hendred

In conclusion just one word of praise for the very practical notes (almost every passage of doubtful interpretation is suitably interpreted by more explicit parallel passages in the prose works), the appendices, and excellent bibliography. The latter does not claim to be exhaustive, but one would rather expect it to include the "Leopardi" of F. de Roberto concerning which, though not a large work, Carducci wrote to the author "Mi pare un' enciclopedia del pensiero e del sentimento leopardiano . . . condotta in metodo esatto e fedele, molto buona e utile."

J. W. K.

IN *East Hendred: a Berkshire Parish*, by Arthur Humphreys, F.S.A. (Hatchards), a beautifully produced volume is offered as a suggestion for a complete parochial survey of the kingdom. It may be said at once that Mr. Humphreys has set his standard high. His book is the result of an immense industry, and is a model at once of thoroughness and conciseness. The parish of East Hendred is a small one. At a census taken in 1555 by order of Cardinal Pole its population is given as 200, and, though towards the middle of the last century it could claim nearly 1,000 inhabitants, the number had fallen in 1911 to 728. It claims the remains, or the traces of the remains, of a Roman road, and a mile north of the village is "the knob," said to be the burial place of King Cwicheim, or, alternatively, the spot where he held the Witan of Wessex in the first half of the Seventh Century. For centuries a large part of the area of the parish was in the hands of ecclesiastics. A notable spoiler of the Church in that district was the Earl of Leicester who, in 1574, received from Queen Elizabeth a grant of the lands of which, till then, the monks of Sheen had been in immemorial possession.

To-day, the outstanding features are the church and the Manor House. The one dates back to the Thirteenth Century, and the other has been the home of the Eystons of Hendred since the Wars of the Roses. Ecclesiastically, this family is bound to the parish by a double tie. For

Some Recent Books

four hundred years their dead have been laid to rest in the chapel they added to the parish church in 1500, while as Catholics they have worshipped since the Reformation in the chapel of St. Amand, which stands on the south side of their home and was one of the chantries dissolved and robbed in 1547. Perhaps its nearness to Oxford accounts for the fact that in its long line of rectors East Hendred can claim an Archbishop of Canterbury—Chichele, the founder of All Souls—a Warden of Merton, and a Master of Balliol. The last—James Brooks—became Bishop of Gloucester, and died in prison because under Elizabeth he refused to take the Oath of Supremacy. Other worthies associated at one time or other with the parish, were Bishop Butler, of the *Analogy*, Charles Butler, the lay leader of the English Catholics in the days of the first Relief Acts, Charles Eyston, the antiquarian, and Thomas Hearne, the well-known Non-juror. But the history of a parish is necessarily and largely concerned with the lives of men and women whose fame has, perhaps, never passed its limits. To this part of his task Mr. Humphreys has brought an extraordinary industry and care. Thus we find full biographical and genealogical notes, not only in the case of families of some social importance, but of the chief yeomen families as well. A family which was well represented during the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries was one which bore the name of Paternoster, several of whom held their lands from the Crown by the tenure of prayer. Thus in the time of Edward I, John Paternoster held sixteen acres "by service of saying daily for the King and the souls of his progenitors the Lord's Prayer, with the salutation of the Blessed Mary."

Members of the Eyston family provide matter for over thirty separate notices. Of William Eyston, 1611-1670, we read that he was "a great sufferer during the time of the civill warrs of England, and was forced to skulk upp and downe by reason of his Religion and Loyalty." We have been taught by the Whig historians to believe that when William of Orange landed in England, his troops went through the country like a procession

East Hendred

of all the virtues. A local chronicler tells a different tale. The old chapel of St. Amand had been repaired by George Eyston in 1687, and seven priests said mass there on September 25th in that year—it was in the day of the brief triumph of James II. A son of this George Eyston tells us what happened when in the following year the Prince of Orange was on his way to Oxford; some “loose fellows” breaking into the chapel “pretended to mock the priest by supping out of his chalice, which they would have taken away had it been silver, as themselves afterwards gave out.” They then broke the sanctuary lamp, tore down “the Jesus Maria from the altar,” and, taking one of the vestments with them to Oxford, “they drest up a mawkin with it, and set it up there on the toppe of a Bon-Fyer.” The London riots of the same year, when the houses of many Catholics were wrecked, specially in the neighbourhood of Lincoln’s Inn Fields, had more serious consequences, and probably caused the death of one of the ladies of the Eyston family: “She was a singular good woeman and dyed about Xmas, 1688, of a fright she took at the mobbe when they plundered the Spanish Ambassador’s chappell and house at Weldhouse in the time of the Revolution.” That the folk of East Hendred were quite capable of asserting their rights on proper occasions may be inferred from the fact that when a new rector paid the bell-ringers a crown instead of the guinea they had expected, he was welcomed to the parish by a peal rung backwards. And though this unfortunate cleric was all the time the Warden of Merton he was commonly called in East Hendred, “‘Dull John,’ from his stupidity.”

Sometimes there was naughtiness in the parish. In 1536 a cleric who had offended was condemned to offer a wax candle, two pounds in weight, to the principal image in the church. An executor who had kept back six-and-eight-pence which ought to have been handed over to the churchwardens was “enjoined to go before the cross in the procession on Sunday next, with naked head and feet, with a torch one lb. weight, which he will offer before the

Some Recent Books

principal image in the said church." The churchwardens' book tells how Catherine Spicer arranged, in consideration of £6 paid annually, for "the preachment of a sermon to the end of the world," but it was the preachment that came to an end. Over three hundred wills are calendared, and many interesting extracts are published in the appendix. It is pleasant to read in the will—1528—of Richard Monyngton, rector of the parish, the following bequest to "Sir William Seuter, my priest, my best chamlet doublet, my chamlet coat, and my little dun nag." The practical charity which sometimes led to legacies for the upkeep of the roads must have been welcomed by the neighbours, but one wonders what were the feelings of "my daughter Anne" when she learned that by her father's will she was "to have according to her deserts," and that those deserts were to be judged by her mother and the executors. Again, was there any heart-burning between "my daughter Joan" and "my daughter Alice," when it was discovered that one was to be paid in money and the other in kind—Joan receiving 20 shillings, and Alice, 10 quarters of barley? Among the historical treasures and relics preserved at Hendred House, two are of singular value—"the drinking can of Blessed Thomas More" and the ebony walking staff which supported Cardinal Fisher on his way to the scaffold. Certainly after reading this story of East Hendred one feels that, though it may be true of countries that the happy ones are those which have no historians, with parishes it is otherwise.

J. G. S.-C.

